

THE

R A M B L E R.

Seu vetus est verum diligo sive novum.

VOL. VI. NEW SERIES.

WILLIAMS AND NORGATE,
14 HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON
AND 20 SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH.
DUBLIN: W. B. KELLY, 8 GRAFTON STREET.

MDCCCLXII.

LONDON :
PRINTED BY LEVEY, ROBSON, AND FRANKLYN,
Great New Street and Fetter Lane.

THE RAMBLER.

VOL. VI. *New Series.* NOVEMBER 1861.

PART XVI.

DÖLLINGER ON THE TEMPORAL POWER.*

AFTER half a year's delay, Dr. Döllinger has redeemed his promise to publish the text of those lectures which made so profound a sensation in the Catholic world. We are sorry to find that the report which fell into our hands at the time, and from which we gave the account that appeared in our May Number, was both defective and incorrect; and we should further regret that we did not follow the example of those journals which abstained from comment so long as no authentic copy was accessible, if it did not appear that, although the argument of the lecturer was lost, his meaning was not, on the whole, seriously misrepresented. Excepting for the sake of the author, who became the object, and of those who unfortunately made themselves the organs, of so much calumny, it is impossible to lament the existence of the erroneous statements which have caused the present publication. Intending at first to prefix an introduction to the text of his lectures, the professor has been led on by the gravity of the occasion, the extent of his subject, and the abundance of materials, to compose a book of 700 pages. Written with all the author's perspicuity of style, though without his usual compression; with the exhaustless information which never fails him, but with an economy of quotation suited to the general public for whom it is designed, it betrays the circumstances of its origin. Subjects are sometimes introduced out of their proper place and order; and there are

* *Kirche und Kirchen; Papstthum und Kirchenstaat* (The Church and the Churches; the Papacy and the Papal States: a historical and political survey). By J. v. Döllinger. Munich, 1861.

occasional repetitions, which show that he had not at starting fixed the proportions of the different parts of his work. This does not, however, affect the logical sequence of the ideas, or the accuracy of the induction. No other book contains—no other writer probably could supply—so comprehensive and so suggestive a description of the state of the Protestant religion, or so impartial an account of the causes which have brought on the crisis of the temporal power.

The *Symbolik* of Möhler was suggested by the beginning of that movement of revival and resuscitation amongst the Protestants, of which Döllinger now surveys the fortunes and the result.* The interval of thirty years has greatly altered the position of the Catholic divines towards their antagonists. Möhler had to deal with the ideas of the Reformation, the works of the Reformers, and the teaching of the confessions; he had to answer in the nineteenth century the theology of the sixteenth. The Protestantism for which he wrote was a complete system, antagonistic to the whole of Catholic theology, and he confuted the one by comparing it with the other, dogma for dogma. But that of which Döllinger treats has lost, for the most part, those distinctive doctrines, not by the growth of unbelief, but in consequence of the very efforts which its most zealous and religious professors have made to defend and to redeem it. The contradictions and errors of the Protestant belief were formerly the subject of controversy with its Catholic opponents; but now the controversy is anticipated and prevented by the undisguised admissions of its desponding friends. It stands no longer as a system consistent, complete, satisfying the judgment and commanding the unconditional allegiance of its followers, and fortified at all points against Catholicism; but disorganised as a Church, its doctrines in a state of dissolution, despaired of by its divines, strong and compact only in its hostility to Rome, but with no positive principle of unity, no ground of resistance, nothing to have faith in, but the determination to reject authority. This, therefore, is the point which Döllinger takes up. Reducing the chief phenomena of religious and social decline to the one head of failing authority, he founds on the state of Protestantism the apology of the Papacy. He abandons to the Protestant theology the destruction of the Protestant Church, and leaves its divines to confute and abjure its principles in detail, and to arrive by the exhaustion of the modes of error, through a painful but honourable process, at the gates of truth; he meets their arguments simply by a chapter of

* See the preface to the first edition of the *Symbolik*.

ecclesiastical history, of which experience teaches them the force ; and he opposes to their theories, not the discussions of controversial theology, but the character of a single institution. The opportunity he has taken to do this, the assumed coincidence between the process of dissolution among the Protestants and the process of regeneration in the court of Rome, is the characteristic peculiarity of the book. Before we proceed to give an analysis of its contents, we will give some extracts from the Preface, which explains the purpose of the whole, and which is alone one of the most important contributions to the religious discussions of the day.

“This book arose from two out of four lectures which were delivered in April this year. How I came to discuss the most difficult and complicated question of our time before a very mixed audience, and in a manner widely different from that usually adopted, I deem myself bound to explain. It was my intention, when I was first requested to lecture, only to speak of the present state of religion in general, with a comprehensive view extending over all mankind. It happened, however, that from those circles which had given the impulse to the lectures, the question was frequently put to me, how the position of the Holy See, the partly consummated, partly threatening, loss of its secular power is to be explained. What answer, I was repeatedly asked, is to be given to those out of the Church who point with triumphant scorn to the numerous episcopal manifestoes, in which the states of the Church are declared essential and necessary to her existence, although the events of the last thirty years appear with increasing distinctness to announce their downfall ? I had found the hope often expressed in newspapers, books, and periodicals, that after the destruction of the temporal power of the Popes, the Church herself would not escape dissolution. At the same time, I was struck by finding in the memoirs of Chateaubriand that Cardinal Bernetti, secretary of state to Leo XII., had said, that if he lived long, there was a chance of his beholding the fall of the temporal power of the Papacy. I had also read, in the letter of a well-informed and trustworthy correspondent from Paris, that the Archbishop of Rheims had related on his return from Rome that Pius IX. had said to him, ‘I am under no illusions, the temporal power must fall. Goyon will abandon me ; I shall then disband my remaining troops. I shall excommunicate the king when he enters the city ; and shall calmly await my death.’

I thought already, in April, that I could perceive, what has become still more clear in October, that the enemies of the secular power of the Papacy are determined, united, predominant, and that there is nowhere a protecting power which possesses the will, and at the same time the means, of averting the catastrophe. I considered it, therefore, probable that an interruption of the temporal dominion would soon ensue,—an interruption which, like others

before it, would also come to an end, and would be followed by a restoration. I resolved, therefore, to take the opportunity, which the lectures gave me, to prepare the public for the coming events, which already cast their shadows upon us, and thus to prevent the scandals, the doubt, and the offence which must inevitably arise if the States of the Church should pass into other hands, although the pastorals of the Bishops had so energetically asserted that they belonged to the integrity of the Church. I meant, therefore, to say, the Church by her nature can very well exist, and did exist for seven centuries, without the territorial possessions of the Popes; afterwards this possession became necessary, and, in spite of great changes and vicissitudes, has discharged in most cases its function of serving as a foundation for the independence and freedom of the Popes. As long as the present state and arrangement of Europe endures, we can discover no other means to secure to the Holy See its freedom, and with it the confidence of all. But the knowledge and the power of God reach farther than ours, and we must not presume to set bounds to the Divine wisdom and omnipotence, or to say to it, In this way and in no other! Should, nevertheless, the threatening consummation ensue, and should the Pope be robbed of his land, one of three eventualities will assuredly come to pass. Either the loss of the state is only temporary, and the territory will revert, after some intervening casualties, either whole or in part, to its legitimate sovereign, or Providence will bring about, by ways unknown to us, and combinations which we cannot divine, a state of things in which the object, namely, the independence and free action of the Holy See, will be attained without the means which have hitherto served; or else we are approaching great catastrophes in Europe, the doom of the whole edifice of the present social order, —events of which the ruin of the Roman State is only the precursor and the herald.

The reasons for which, of these three possibilities, I think the first the most probable, I have developed in this book. Concerning the second alternative, there is nothing to be said; it is an unknown, and therefore indescribable quantity. Only we must retain it against certain over-confident assertions which profess to know the secret things to come, and, trespassing on the divine domain, wish to subject the Future absolutely to the laws of the immediate Past. That the third possibility must also be admitted, few of those who studiously observe the signs of the time will dispute. One of the ablest historians and statesmen—Niebuhr—wrote on the 5th October 1830: 'If God does not miraculously aid, a destruction is in store for us such as the Roman world underwent in the middle of the third century—destruction of prosperity, of freedom, of civilisation, and of literature.' And we have proceeded much farther on the inclined plane since then. The European Powers have overturned, or have allowed to be overturned, the two pillars of their existence,—the principle of legitimacy, and the public law of nations. Those monarchs who have made themselves the slaves of the Revo-

lution, to do its work, are the active agents in the historical drama ; the others stand aside as quiet spectators, in expectation of inheriting something, like Prussia and Russia, or bestowing encouragement and assistance, like England, or as passive invalids, like Austria and the sinking empire of Turkey. But the Revolution is a permanent chronic disease, breaking out now in one place, now in another, sometimes seizing several members together. The Pentarchy is dissolved ; the Holy Alliance, which, however defective or open to abuse, was one form of political order, is buried : the right of might prevails in Europe. Is it a process of renovation or a process of dissolution in which European society is plunged ? I still think the former ; but I must, as I have said, admit the possibility of the other alternative. If it occurs, then, when the powers of destruction have done their work, it will be the business of the Church at once to coöperate actively in the reconstruction of social order out of the ruins, both as a connecting civilising power, and as the preserver and dispenser of moral and religious tradition. And thus the Papacy, with or without territory, has its own function and its appointed mission.

These, then, were the ideas from which I started ; and it may be supposed that my language concerning the immediate fate of the temporal power of the Pope necessarily sounded ambiguous, that I could not well come with the confidence which is given to other—perhaps more far-sighted—men before my audience, and say, Rely upon it, the States of the Church—the land from Radicofani to Ceperano, from Ravenna to Cività Vecchia, shall and must and will invariably remain to the Popes. Heaven and earth shall pass away before the Roman State shall pass away. I could not do this, because I did not at that time believe it, nor do I now ; but am only confident that the Holy See will not be permanently deprived of the conditions necessary for the fulfilment of its mission. Thus the substance of my words was this : Let no one lose faith in the Church if the secular principality of the Pope should disappear for a season, or for ever. It is not essence, but accident ; not end, but means ; it began late ; it was formerly something quite different from what it is now. It justly appears to us indispensable ; and as long as the existing order lasts in Europe, it must be maintained at any price ; or if it is violently interrupted, it must be restored. But a political settlement of Europe is conceivable in which it would be superfluous, and then it would be an oppressive burden. At the same time I wished to defend Pope Pius IX. and his government against many accusations, and to point out that the inward infirmities and deficiencies which undeniably exist in the country, by which the state has been reduced to so deplorable a condition of weakness and helplessness, are not attributable to him ; that, on the contrary, he has shown, both before and since 1848, the best will to reform ; and that by him, and under him, much has been really improved.

The newspaper reports, written down at home from memory, gave but an inaccurate representation of a discourse which did not

attempt in the usual way to cut the knot, but which, with *buts* and *ifs*, and referring to certain elements in the decision which are generally left out of the calculation, spoke of an uncertain future, and of various possibilities. This was not to be avoided. Any reproduction which was not quite literal must, in spite of the good intentions of the reporter, have given rise to false interpretations. When, therefore, one of the most widely-read papers reported the first lecture, without any intentional falsification, but with omissions which altered the sense and the tendency of my words, I immediately proposed to the conductors to print my manuscript; but this offer was declined. In other accounts in the daily press, I was often unable to recognise my ideas; and words were put into my mouth which I had never uttered. And here I will admit that, when I gave the lectures, I did not think that they would be discussed by the press, but expected that, like others of the same kind, they would at most be mentioned in a couple of words, *in futuram oblivionem*. Of the controversy which sprang up at once, in separate works and in newspaper articles, in Germany, France, England, Italy, and even in America, I shall not speak. Much of it I have not read. The writers often did not even ask themselves whether the report which accident put into their hands, and which they carelessly adopted, was at all accurate. But I must refer to an account in one of the most popular English periodicals, because I am there brought into a society to which I do not belong. The author of an article in the July number of the *Edinburgh Review* appeals to me, misunderstanding the drift of my words, and erroneously believing that I had already published an apology of my orthodoxy. . . . A sharp attack upon me in the *Dublin Review* I know only from extracts in English papers; but I can see from the vehemence with which the writer pronounces himself against liberal institutions, that, even after the appearance of this book, I cannot reckon on coming to an understanding with him.

The excitement which was caused by my lectures, or rather by the accounts of them in the papers, had this advantage, that it brought to light, in a way which to many was unexpected, how widely, how deeply, and how firmly the attachment of the people to the See of St. Peter is rooted. For the sake of this I was glad to accept all the attacks and animosity which fell on me in consequence. But why, it will be asked, and I have been asked innumerable times,—why not cut short misunderstandings by the immediate publication of the lectures, which must, as a whole, have been written beforehand? why wait for five months? For this I had two reasons: first, it was not merely a question of misunderstanding. Much of what I had actually said had made an unpleasant impression in many quarters, especially among our optimists. I should, therefore, with my bare statements, have become involved in an agitating discussion in pamphlets and newspapers, and that was not an attractive prospect. The second reason was this: I expected that the further progress of events in Italy, the irresistible logic of facts, would dispose minds

to receive certain truths. I hoped that people would learn by degrees, in the school of events, that it is not enough always to be reckoning with the figures, 'revolution,' 'secret societies,' 'Mazzinism,' 'Atheism,' or to estimate things only by the standard supplied by the 'Jew of Verona,' but that other factors must be admitted into the calculation; for instance, the condition of the Italian clergy, and its position towards the laity. I wished, therefore, to let a few months go by, before I came before the public. Whether I judged rightly, the reception of this book will show.

I thoroughly understand those who think it censurable that I should have spoken in detail of situations and facts which are gladly ignored, or touched with a light and hasty hand, and that especially at the present crisis. I myself was restrained for ten years by these considerations, in spite of the feeling which urged me to speak on the question of the Roman government, and it required the circumstances I have described, I may almost say, to compel me to speak publicly on the subject. I beg of these persons to weigh the following points. First, when an author openly exposes a state of things already abundantly discussed in the press, if he draws away the necessarily very transparent covering from the gaping wounds which are not on the Church herself, but on an institution nearly connected with her, and whose infirmities she is made to feel, it may fairly be supposed that he does it, in agreement with the example of earlier friends and great men of the Church, only to show the possibility and the necessity of the cure, in order, so far as in him lies, to weaken the reproach that the defenders of the Church see only the mote in the eyes of others, not the beam in their own, and with narrow-hearted prejudice endeavour to soften, or to dissimulate, or to deny every fact which is or which appears unfavourable to their cause. He does it in order that it may be understood that where the powerlessness of men to effect a cure becomes manifest, God interposes in order to sift on His threshing-floor the chaff from the wheat, and to consume it with the fire of the catastrophes which are only His judgments and remedies. Secondly, I could not, as a historian, present the effects without going back to their causes; and it was therefore my duty, as it is that of every religious inquirer and observer, to try to contribute something to the *Theodicea*. He that undertakes to write on such lofty interests, which nearly affect the weal and woe of the Church, cannot avoid examining and displaying the wisdom and justice of God in the conduct of terrestrial events regarding them. The fate which has overtaken the Roman States must above all be considered in the light of a Divine ordinance for the advantage of the Church. Seen by that light, it assumes the character of a trial, which will continue until the object is attained, and the welfare of the Church so far secured.

It seemed evident to me, that as a new order of things in Europe lies in the design of Providence, the disease, through which for the last half-century the States of the Church unquestionably have passed, might be the transition to a new form. To describe this

malady without overlooking or concealing any of the symptoms was therefore an undertaking which I could not avoid. The disease has its source in the inward contradiction and discord of the institutions and conditions of the government ; for the modern French institutions stand there, without any reconciling qualifications, beside those of the medieval hierarchy. Neither of these elements is strong enough to expel the other ; and either of them would, if it prevailed alone, be again a form of disease. Yet, in the history of the last few years I recognise symptoms of convalescence, however feeble, obscure, and equivocal its traces may appear. What we behold is not death or hopeless decay ; it is a purifying process, painful, consuming, penetrating bone and marrow,—such as God inflicts on His chosen persons and institutions. There is abundance of dross, and time is necessary before the gold can come pure out of the furnace. In the course of this process it may happen that the territorial dominion will be interrupted, that the state may be broken up or pass into other hands ; but it will revive, though perhaps in another form, and with a different kind of government. In a word, *sanabilibus laboramus malis* ; that is what I wished to show ; that, I believe, I have shown. Now, and for the last forty years, the condition of the Roman States is the heel of Achilles of the Catholic Church, the standing reproach for adversaries throughout the world, and a stumbling-block for thousands. Not as though the objections, which are founded on the fact of this transitory disturbance and discord in the social and political sphere, possessed any weight in a theological point of view : but it cannot be denied that they are of incalculable influence on the disposition of the world external to the Church.

Whenever a state of disease has appeared in the Church, there has been but one method of cure,—that of an awakened, renovated, healthy consciousness and of an enlightened public opinion in the Church. The good will of the ecclesiastical rulers and heads has not been able to accomplish the cure, unless sustained by the general sense and conviction of the clergy and of the laity. The healing of the great malady of the sixteenth century, the true internal reformation of the Church, only became possible when people ceased to disguise or to deny the evil, and to pass it by with silence and concealment,—when so powerful and irresistible a public opinion had formed itself in the Church, that its commanding influence could no longer be evaded. At the present day, what we want is the whole truth, not merely the perception that the temporal power of the Pope is required by the Church,—for that is obvious to every body, at least out of Italy, and every thing has been said that can be said about it ; but also the knowledge of the conditions under which this power is possible for the future. The history of the Popes is full of instances where their best intentions were not fulfilled, and their strongest resolutions broke down, because the interests of a firmly compacted class resisted like an impenetrable hedge of thorns. Hadrian VI. was fully resolved to set about the reformation in earnest ; and yet he achieved virtually nothing, and felt himself, though in possession

of supreme power, altogether powerless against the passive resistance of all those who should have been his instruments in the work. Only when public opinion, even in Italy, and in Rome itself, was awakened, purified, and strengthened ; when the cry for reform resounded imperatively on every side,—then only was it possible for the Popes to overcome the resistance in the inferior spheres, and, gradually and step by step, to open the way for a more healthy state. May, therefore, a powerful, healthy, unanimous public opinion in Catholic Europe come to the aid of Pius IX. ! . . .

Concerning another part of this book I have a few words to say. I have given a survey of all the Churches and ecclesiastical communities now existing. The obligation of attempting this presented itself to me, because I had to explain both the universal importance of the Papacy as a power for all the world, and the things which it actually performs. This could not be done fully without exhibiting the internal condition of the Churches which have rejected it, and withdrawn from its influence. It is true that the plan increased under my hands, and I endeavoured to give as clear a picture as possible of the development which has accomplished itself in the separated Churches since the Reformation, and through it, in consequence of the views and principles which had been once for all adopted. I have, therefore, admitted into my description no feature which is not, in my opinion, an effect, a result, however remote, of those principles and doctrines. There is doubtless room for discussion in detail upon this point, and there will unavoidably be a decided opposition to this book, if it should be noticed beyond the limits of the Church to which I belong. I hope that there also the justice will be done me of believing that I was far from having any intention of offending ; that I have only said what must be said, if we would go to the bottom of these questions ; that I had to do with institutions which, because of the dogmas and principles from which they spring, must, like a tree that is nailed to a wall, remain in one position, however unnatural it may be. I am quite ready to admit that, on the opposite side, the men are often better than the system to which they are, or deem themselves, attached ; and that, on the contrary, in the Church the individuals are, on the average, inferior in theory and in practice to the system under which they live. . . .

The union of the two Religions, which would be socially and politically the salvation of Germany and of Europe, is not possible at present ; first, because the greater, more active, and more influential portion of the German Protestants do not desire it, for political or religious reasons, in any form or under any practicable conditions. It is impossible, secondly, because negotiations concerning the mode and the conditions of union can no longer be carried on. For this, plenipotentiaries on both sides are required ; and these only the Catholic Church is able to appoint, by virtue of her ecclesiastical organisation, not the Protestants. . . . Nevertheless, theologically, Protestants and Catholics have come nearer each other ; for those capital doctrines, those articles with

which the Church was to stand or fall, for the sake of which the Reformers declared separation from the Catholic Church to be necessary, are now confuted and given up by Protestant theology, or are retained only nominally, whilst other notions are connected with the words. . . . Protestant theology is at the present day less hostile, so to speak, than the theologians. For whilst theology has levelled the strongest bulwarks and doctrinal barriers which the Reformation had set up to confirm the separation, the divines, instead of viewing favourably the consequent facilities for union, often labour, on the contrary, to conceal the fact, or to provide new points of difference. Many of them probably agree with Stahl of Berlin, who said, shortly before his death, 'Far from supposing that the breach of the sixteenth century can be healed, we ought, if it had not already occurred, to make it now.' This, however, will not continue; and a future generation, perhaps that which is even now growing up, will rather adopt the recent declaration of Heinrich Leo, 'In the Roman Catholic Church a process of purification has taken place since Luther's day; and if the Church had been in the days of Luther what the Roman Catholic Church in Germany actually is at present, it would never have occurred to him to assert his opposition so energetically as to bring about a separation.' Those who think thus will then be the right men and the chosen instruments for the acceptable work of the reconciliation of the Churches, and the true unity of Germany. Upon the day when, on both sides, the conviction shall arise vivid and strong, that Christ really desires the unity of His Church, that the division of Christendom, the multiplicity of Churches, is displeasing to God, that he who helps to prolong this situation must answer for it to the Lord,—on that day four-fifths of the traditional polemics of the Protestants against the Church will with one blow be set aside, like chaff and rubbish; for four-fifths consist of misunderstandings, logomachies, and wilful falsifications, or relate to personal, and therefore accidental, things, which are utterly insignificant where only principles and dogmas are at stake.

On that day, also, much will be changed on the Catholic side. Thenceforward the character of Luther and the Reformers will no more be dragged forward in the pulpit. The clergy, mindful of the saying, *Interfice errores, diligite homines*, will always conduct themselves towards members of other Churches in conformity with the rules of charity, and will therefore assume, in all cases where there are no clear proofs to the contrary, the *bona fides* of opponents. They will never forget that no man is convinced and won over by bitter words and violent attacks, but that every one is rather repelled by them. Warned by the words of the Epistle to the Romans (xiv. 13), they will be more careful than heretofore to give to their separated brethren no scandal, no grounds of accusation against the Church. Accordingly, in popular instruction and in religious life, they will always make the great truths of salvation the centre of all their teaching: they will not treat secondary things in life and doc-

trine as though they were of the first importance ; but, on the contrary, they will keep alive in the people the consciousness that such things are but means to an end, and are only of inferior consequence and subsidiary value.

Until that day shall dawn upon Germany, it is our duty as Catholics, in the words of Cardinal Diepenbrock, ‘to bear the religious separation in a spirit of penance for guilt incurred in common.’ We must acknowledge that here also God has caused much good as well as much evil to proceed from the errors of men, from the contests and passions of the sixteenth century ; that the anxiety of the German nation to see the intolerable abuses and scandals in the Church removed was fully justified, and sprang from the better qualities of our people, and from their moral indignation at the desecration and corruption of holy things, which were degraded to selfish and hypocritical purposes. We do not refuse to admit that the great separation, and the storms and sufferings connected with it, was an awful judgment upon Catholic Christendom, which clergy and laity had but too well deserved,—a judgment which has had an improving and salutary effect. The great conflict of intellects has purified the European atmosphere, has impelled the human mind on to new courses, and has promoted a rich scientific and literary life. Protestant theology, with its restless spirit of inquiry, has gone along by the side of the Catholic, exciting and awakening, warning and vivifying ; and every eminent Catholic divine in Germany will gladly admit that he owes much to the writings of Protestant scholars.

We must also acknowledge that in the Church the rust of abuses, and of a mechanical superstition, is always forming afresh ; that the spiritual in religion is sometimes materialised, and therefore degraded, deformed, and applied to their own loss, by the servants of the Church, through their indolence and want of intelligence, and by the people, through their ignorance. The true spirit of reform must therefore never depart from the Church, but must periodically break out with renovating strength, and penetrate the mind and the will of the clergy. In this sense we do not refuse to admit the justice of a call to penance, when it proceeds from those who are not of us,—that is, of a warning carefully to examine our religious life and pastoral conduct, and to remedy what is found defective.

At the same time it must not be forgotten that the separation did not ensue in consequence of the abuses of the Church. For the duty and necessity of removing these abuses has always been recognised ; and only the difficulty of the thing, the not always unjustifiable fear lest the wheat should be pulled up with the tares, prevented for a time the Reformation, which was accomplished in the Church and through her. Separation on account merely of abuses in ecclesiastical life, when the doctrine is the same, is rejected as criminal by the Protestants as well as by us. It is, therefore, for doctrine’s sake that the separation occurred ; and the general discontent of the people, the weakening of ecclesiastical authority by the existence of

abuses, only facilitated the adoption of the new doctrines. But now on one side some of these defects and evils in the life of the Church have disappeared, the others have greatly diminished since the reforming movement; and on the other side, the principal doctrines for which they separated, and on the truth of which, and their necessity for salvation, the right and duty of secession was based, are given up by Protestant science, deprived of their Scriptural basis by exegesis, or a least made very uncertain by the opposition of the most eminent Protestant divines. Meanwhile we live in hopes, comforting ourselves with the conviction that history, or that process of development in Europe which is being accomplished before our eyes, as well in society and politics as in religion, is the powerful ally of the friends of ecclesiastical union; and we hold out our hands to Christians on the other side for a combined war of resistance against the destructive movements of the age."

There are two circumstances which make us fear that the work will not be received in the spirit in which it is written, and that its object will not immediately be attained. The first of these is the extraordinary effect which was produced by the declaration which the author made on the occasion of the late assembly of the Catholic associations of Germany at Munich. He stated simply, what is understood by every Catholic out of Italy, and intelligible to every reasonable Protestant, that the freedom of the Church imperatively requires that, in order to protect the Pope from the perils which menace him, particularly in our age, he should possess a sovereignty not merely nominal, and that his right to his dominions is as good as that of all other legitimate sovereigns. In point of fact, this expression of opinion, which occurs even in the garbled reports of the lectures, leaves all those questions on which it is possible for serious and dispassionate men to be divided entirely open. It does not determine whether there was any excuse for the disaffection of the Papal subjects; whether the security afforded by a more extensive dominion is greater than the increased difficulty of administration under the conditions inherited from the French occupation; whether an organised system of tribute or domains might be sufficient, in conjunction with a more restricted territory; whether the actual loss of power is or is not likely to prove a misfortune for religion. The storm of applause with which these words, simply expressing that in which all agree, were received, must have suggested to the speaker that his countrymen in general are unprepared to believe that one, who has no other aspiration in his life and his works than the advancement of the Catholic religion, can speak without a reverent awe of the temporal government,

or can witness without dismay its impending fall. They must have persuaded themselves that not only the details, but the substance of his lectures had been entirely misreported, and that his views were as free from novelty as destitute of offence. It is hard to believe that such persons will be able to reconcile themselves to the fearless and straightforward spirit in which the first of Church historians discusses the history of his own age.

Another consideration, almost equally significant with the attitude of the great mass of Catholics, is the silence of the minority who agree with Döllinger. Those earnest Catholics who, in their Italian patriotism, insist on the possibility of reconciling the liberty of the Holy See with the establishment of an ideal unity, Passaglia, Tosti, the followers of Gioberti, and the disciples of Rosmini, have not hesitated to utter openly their honest but most inconceivable persuasion. But on the German side of the Alps, where no political agitation affects the religious judgment, or drives men into disputes, those eminent thinkers who agree with Döllinger are withheld by various considerations from publishing their views. Sometimes it is the hopelessness of making an impression, sometimes the grave inconvenience of withstanding the current of opinion, that makes them keep silence; and their silence leaves those who habitually follow them not only without means of expressing their views, but often without decided views to express. The same influences which deprive Döllinger of the open support of these natural allies, will impede the success of his work, until events have outstripped ideas, and until men awake to the discovery that what they refused to anticipate or to prepare for, is already accomplished.

Piety sometimes gives birth to scruples, and faith to superstition, when they are not directed by wisdom and knowledge. One source of the difficulty of which we are speaking, is as much a defect of faith as a defect of knowledge. Just as it is difficult for some Catholics to believe that the supreme spiritual authority on earth could ever be in unworthy hands, so they find it hard to reconcile the reverence due to the Vicar of Christ, and the promises made to him, with the acknowledgment of intolerable abuses in his temporal administration. It is a comfort to make the best of the case, to draw conclusions from the exaggerations, the inventions, and the malice of the accusers against the justice of the accusation, and in favour of the accused. It is a temptation to our weakness and to our consciences to defend the Pope as we would defend ourselves—with the same care and zeal, with the same uneasy secret consciousness that

there are weak points in the case which can best be concealed by diverting attention from them. What the defence gains in energy, it loses in sincerity; the cause of the Church, which is the cause of truth, is mixed up and confused with human elements, and is injured by a degrading alliance. In this way even piety may lead to immorality, and devotion to the Pope may lead away from God.

The position of perpetual antagonism to a spirit which we abhor; the knowledge that the clamour against the temporal power is in very many instances inspired by hatred of the spiritual authority; the indignation at the impure motives mixed up with the movement,—all these things easily blind Catholics to the fact that our attachment to the Pope as our spiritual Head, our notion that his civil sovereignty is a safeguard of his freedom, are the real motives of our disposition to deny the truth of the accusations made against his government. It is hard to believe that imputations which take the form of insults, and which strike at the Church through the State, are well founded, and to distinguish the design and the occasion from the facts. It is, perhaps, more than we can expect of men, that, after defending the Pope as a sovereign because he is a pontiff, and adopting against his enemies the policy of unconditional defence, they will consent to adopt a view which corroborates to a great extent the assertions they have combated, and implicitly condemns their tactics. It is natural to oppose one extreme by another; and those who avoid both easily appear to be capitulating with error. The effects of this spirit of opposition are not confined to those who are engaged in resisting the No-popery party in England, or the revolution in Italy. The fate of the temporal power hangs neither on the Italian ministry nor on English influence, but on the decision of the Emperor of the French; and the loudest maintainers of the rights of the Holy See are among that party who have been the most zealous adversaries of the imperial system. The French Catholics behold in the Roman policy of the Emperor a scheme for obtaining over the Church a power of which they would be the first victims. Their religious freedom is in jeopardy while he has the fate of the Pope in his hands. That which is elsewhere simply a manifestation of opinion and a moral influence, is in France an active interference and a political power. They alone among Catholic subjects can bring a pressure to bear on him who has had the initiative in the Italian movement. They fear by silence to incur a responsibility for criminal acts. For them it is a season for action, and the time has not yet come when they can

speak with judicial impartiality, or with the freedom of history, or determine how far, in the pursuit of his ambitious ends, Napoleon III. is the instrument of Providence, or how far, without any merit of his own, he is likely to fulfil the expectations of those who see in him a new Constantine. Whilst they maintain this unequal war, they naturally identify the rights of the Church with her interests; and the wrongs of the Pope are before their eyes so as to eclipse the realities of the Roman government. The most vehement and one-sided of those who have dwelt exclusively on the crimes of the Revolution and the justice of the Papal cause, the Bishop of Orleans for instance, or Count de Montalembert, might without inconsistency, and doubtless would without hesitation, subscribe to almost every word in Döllinger's work; but in the position they have taken, they would probably deem such adhesion a great rhetorical error, and fatal to the effect of their own writings. There is, therefore, an allowance to be made, which is by no means a reproach, for the peculiar situation of the Catholics in France.

When Christine of Sweden was observed to gaze long and intently at the statue of Truth in Rome, a court-like prelate observed that this admiration for Truth did her honour, as it was seldom shared by persons in her station. "That," said the Queen, "is because truths are not all made of marble." Men are seldom zealous for an idea in which they do not perceive some reflection of themselves, in which they have not embarked some portion of their individuality, or which they cannot connect with some subjective purpose of their own. It is often more easy to sympathise with a person in whose opposite views we discern a weakness corresponding to our own, than with one who unsympathetically avoids to colour the objectivity of truth, and is guided in his judgment by facts, not by wishes. We endeavoured, not many months ago, to show how remote the theology of Catholic Germany is in its scientific spirit from that of other countries, and how far asunder are science and policy. The same method applied to the events of our own day, must be yet more startling, and for a time we can scarcely anticipate that the author of this work will escape an apparent isolation between the reserve of those who share his views, but are not free to speak, and the foregone conclusions of most of those who have already spoken. But a book which treats of contemporary events in accordance with the signs of the time, not with the aspirations of men, possesses in time itself an invincible auxiliary. When the lesson which this great writer draws from the example of the medieval Popes

has borne its fruit; when the purpose for which he has written is attained, and the freedom of the Holy See from revolutionary aggression and arbitrary protection is recovered by the heroic determination to abandon that which in the course of events has ceased to be a basis of independence,—he will be the first, but no longer the only, proclaimer of new ideas, and he will not have written in vain.

The Christian religion, as it addresses and adapts itself to all mankind, bears towards the varieties of national character a relation of which there was no example in the religions of antiquity, and which heresy repudiates and inevitably seeks to destroy. For heresy, like paganism, is national, and dependent both on the particular disposition of the people and on the government of the state. It is identified with definite local conditions, and moulded by national and political peculiarities. Catholicity alone is universal in its character and mission, and independent of those circumstances by which states are established, and nations are distinguished from each other. Even Rome had not so far extended her limits, nor so thoroughly subjugated and amalgamated the races that obeyed her, as to secure the Church from the natural reaction of national spirit against a religion which claimed a universality beyond even that of the imperial power. The first and most terrible assault of ethnicism was in Persia, where Christianity appeared as a Roman, and therefore a foreign and a hostile, system. As the Empire gradually declined, and the nationalities, no longer oppressed beneath a vigorous central force, began to revive, the heresies, by a natural affinity, associated themselves with them. The Donatist schism, in which no other country joined, was an attempt of the African people to establish a separate national Church. Later on, the Egyptians adopted the Monophysite heresy as the national faith, which has survived to this day in the Coptic Church. In Armenia similar causes produced like effects.

In the twelfth century—not, as is commonly supposed, in the time of Photius and Cerularius, for religious communion continued to subsist between the Latins and the Greeks at Constantinople till about the time of Innocent III., but after the Crusades had embittered the antagonism between East and West—another great national separation occurred. In the Eastern empire the communion with Rome was hateful to the two chief authorities. The patriarch was ambitious to extend his own absolute jurisdiction over the whole empire, the emperor wished to increase that power as the instrument of his own; out of this threefold combination of interests

sprang the Byzantine system. It was founded on the ecclesiastical as well as civil despotism of the emperor, and on the exclusive pride of the people in its nationality; that is, on those things which are most essentially opposed to the Catholic spirit, and to the nature of a universal Church. In consequence of the schism, the sovereign became supreme over the canons of the Church and the laws of the State; and to this imperial papacy the Archbishop of Thessalonica, in the beginning of the fifteenth century, justly attributes the ruin and degradation of the Empire. Like the Eastern schism, the schism of the West in the fourteenth century arose from the predominance of national interests in the Church: it proceeded from the endeavour to convert the Holy See into a possession of the French people and a subject of the French crown. Again, not long after, the Hussite revolution sprang from the union of a new doctrine with the old antipathy of the Bohemians for the Germans, which had begun in times when the boundaries of Christianity ran between the two nations, and which led to a strictly national separation, which has not yet exhausted its political effects.

Though the Reformation had not its origin in national feelings, yet they became a powerful instrument in the hands of Luther, and ultimately prevailed over the purely theological elements of the movement. The Lutheran system was looked on by the Germans with patriotic pride as the native fruit and especial achievement of the genius of their country, and it was adopted out of Germany only by the kindred races of Scandinavia. In every other land to which it has been transplanted by the migrations of this century, Lutheranism appears as eradicated from its congenial soil, loses gradually its distinctive features, and becomes assimilated to the more consolatory system of Geneva. Calvinism exhibited from the first no traces of the influence of national character, and to this it owes its greater extension; whilst in the third form of Protestantism, the Anglican Church, nationality is the predominant characteristic. In whatever country and in whatever form Protestantism has prevailed, it has always carried out the principle of separation and local limitation, by seeking to subject itself to the civil power, and to confine the Church within the jurisdiction of the State. It is dependent not so much on national character as on political authority, and has grafted itself rather on the State than on the people. But the institution which Christ founded in order to collect all nations together in one fold under one shepherd, while tolerating and respecting the natural historical distinctions of nations and of States, endeavours to reconcile antagonism, and

to smooth away barriers between them, instead of estranging them by artificial differences, and erecting new obstacles to their harmony. The Church can neither submit as a whole to the influence of a particular people, nor impose on one the features or the habits of another ; for she is exalted in her catholicity above the differences of race, and above the claims of political power. At once the most firm and the most flexible institution in the world, she is all things to all nations, —educating each in her own spirit, without violence to its nature, and assimilating it to herself without prejudice to the originality of its native character. Whilst she thus transforms them, not by reducing them to a uniform type, but by raising them towards a common elevation, she receives from them services in return. Each healthy and vigorous nation that is converted is a dynamic as well as a numerical increase in the resources of the Church, by bringing an accession of new and peculiar qualities, as well as of quantity and numbers. So far from seeking sameness, or flourishing only in one atmosphere, she is enriched and strengthened by all the varieties of national character and intellect. In the mission of the Catholic Church, each nation has its function, which its own position and nature indicate and enable it to fulfil. Thus the extinct nations of antiquity survive in the beneficial action they continue to exert within her, and she still feels and acknowledges the influence of the African or of the Cappadocian mind.

The condition of this immunity from the predominant influence of national and political divisions, and of this indifference to the attachment of particular states and races,—the security of unity and universality,—consists in the existence of a single, supreme, independent head. The primacy is the bulwark, or rather the corner-stone, of Catholicism, without it, there would be as many Churches as there are nations or states. Not one of those who have denounced the Papacy as a usurpation has ever attempted to show that the condition which its absence necessarily involves is theologically desirable, or that it is the will of God. It remains the most radical and conspicuous distinction between the Catholic Church and the sects. Those who attempt to do without it are compelled to argue that there is no earthly office divinely appointed for the government of the Church, and that nobody has received the mission to conduct ecclesiastical affairs, and to preserve the divine order in religion. The several local Churches may have an earthly ruler, but for the whole Church of Christ there is no such protection. Christ, therefore, is the only head they acknowledge, and they must

necessarily declare separation, isolation, and discord to be a principle and the normal condition of His Church. The rejection of the primacy of St. Peter has driven men on to a slippery course, where all the steps are downwards. The Greeks first proclaimed that they recognised no pope, that each patriarch ruled over a portion of the Church. The Anglicans rejected both pope and patriarch, and admitted no ecclesiastical order higher than the episcopate. Foreign Protestantism refused to tolerate even bishops, or any authority but the parish clergy under the supremacy of the ruler of the land. Then the sects abolished the local jurisdiction of the parish clergy, and retained only preachers. At length the ministry was rejected as an office altogether, and the Quakers made each individual his own prophet, priest, and doctor.

The Papacy, that unique institution, the crown of the Catholic system, exhibits in its history the constant working of that law which is at the foundation of the life of the Church, the law of continuous organic development. It shared the vicissitudes of the Church, and had its part in every thing which influences the course and mode of her existence. In early times it grew in silence and obscurity, its features were rarely and imperfectly distinguishable; but even then the Popes exerted their authority in all directions, and while the wisdom with which it was exercised was often questioned, the right itself was undisputed. So long as the Roman empire upheld in its strong framework and kept together the Church, which was confined mostly within its bounds, and checked with the stern discipline of a uniform law the manifestations of national and local divergence, the interference of the Holy See was less frequently required, and the reins of Church government did not need to be tightly drawn. When a new order of states emerged from the chaos of the great migration, the Papacy, which alone stood erect amid the ruins of the empire, became the centre of a new system and the moderator of a new code. The long contest with the Germanic empire exhausted the political power both of the empire and of the Papacy, and the position of the Holy See, in the midst of a multitude of equal states, became more difficult and more unfavourable. The Popes were forced to rely on the protection of France, their supremacy over the states was at an end, and the resistance of the nations commenced. The schism, the opposition of the general councils, the circumstances which plunged the Holy See into the intrigues of Italian politics, and at last the Reformation, hastened the decline of that extensive social and political power, the echoes and reminiscences of which

occasioned disaster and repulse whenever an attempt was made to exercise it. Ever since the Tridentine age, the Popes have confined themselves more and more exclusively to the religious domain ; and here the Holy See is as powerful and as free at the present day as at any previous period of its history. The perils and the difficulties which surround it arise from temporal concerns,—from the state of Italy, and from the possession of the pontifical dominions.

As the Church advances towards fulness and maturity in her forms, bringing forward her exhaustless resources, and calling into existence a wealth of new elements,—societies, corporations, and institutions,—so is the need more deeply felt for a powerful supreme guide to keep them all in health and harmony, to direct them in their various spheres and in their several ways towards the common ends and purposes of all, and thus to provide against decay, variance, and confusion. Such an office the Primacy alone can discharge, and the importance of the Papacy increases as the organisation of the Church is more complete. One of its most important but most delicate duties, is to act as an independent, impartial, and dispassionate mediator between the churches and the governments of the different states, and between the conflicting claims and contradictory idiosyncrasies of the various nations. Yet, though the Papacy is so obviously an essential part of a Church whose mission is to all mankind, it is the chosen object of attack both to enemies of Catholicism and to discontented Catholics. Serious and learned men complain of its tyranny, and say that it claims universal dominion, and watches for an opportunity of obtaining it ; and yet, in reality, there is no power on earth whose action is restricted by more sacred and irresistible bonds than that of the Holy See. It is only by the closest fidelity to the laws and tradition of the Church that the Popes are able to secure the obedience and the confidence of Catholics. Pius VII., who, by sweeping away the ancient church of France, and depriving thirty-seven protesting Bishops of their sees, committed the most arbitrary act ever done by a Pope, has himself described the rules which guided the exercise of his authority. “The nature and constitution of the Catholic Church impose on the Pope, who is the head of the Church, certain limits which he cannot transgress. . . . The Bishops of Rome have never believed that they could tolerate any alteration in those portions of the discipline which are directly ordained by Jesus Christ, or in those which, by their nature, are connected with dogma, or in those which heretics assail in support of their innovations.” The chief points urged against the ambition of

Rome are the claim of the deposing power, according to the theory that all kinds of power are united in the Church, and the protest against the Peace of Westphalia, the basis of the public law and political order of modern Europe. It is enough to cite one of the many authorities which may be cited in refutation of the first objection. Cardinal Antonelli, prefect of Propaganda, states in his letter to the Irish Bishops, 1791, that "the See of Rome has never taught that faith is not to be kept with those of another religion, or that an oath sworn to kings who are separated from the Catholic communion may be broken, or that the Pope is permitted to touch their temporal rights and possessions." The Bull in which Boniface VIII., set up the theory of the supremacy of the spiritual over the secular power was retracted soon after his death.

The protest of Innocent X. against the Peace of Westphalia is one of the glories of the Papacy. That peace was concluded on an unchristian and tyrannical principle introduced by the Reformation, that the subjects may be compelled to follow the religion of the ruler. This was very different in principle and in effect from the intolerance of the ages of faith, when prince and people were members of one religion, and all were agreed that no other could be permitted in the State. Every heresy that arose in the Middle Ages involved revolutionary consequences, and would inevitably have overthrown State and society, as well as Church, wherever it prevailed. The Albigenses, who provoked the cruel legislation against heretics, and who were exterminated by fire and sword, were the Socialists of those days. They assailed the fundamental institutions of society, marriage, family, and property, and their triumph would have plunged Europe into the barbarism and license of pagan times. The principles of the Waldenses and the Lollards were likewise incompatible with European civilisation. In those days the law relating to religion was the same for all. The Pope as well as the king would have lost his crown if he had fallen into heresy. During a thousand years, from the fall of Rome to the appearance of Luther, no Catholic prince ever made an attempt to introduce a new religion into his dominions, or to abandon the old. But the Reformation taught that this was the supreme duty of princes; whilst Luther declared that in matters of faith the individual is above every authority, and that a child could understand the Scriptures better than Popes or councils, he taught at the same time, with an inconsistency which he never attempted to remove, that it is the duty of the civil power to exterminate Popery, to set up the Gospel, and to suppress every other religion.

The result was a despotism such as the world had never seen. It was worse than the Byzantine system; for there no attempt was made to change the faith of the people. The Protestant princes exercised an ecclesiastical authority more arbitrary than Pope had ever possessed; for the papal authority can only be used to maintain an existing doctrine, whilst theirs was aggressive and wholly unlimited. Possessing the power to command, and to alter in religion, they naturally acquired by degrees a corresponding absolutism in the civil order. The consistories, the office by which the sovereign ruled the Church, were the commencement of bureaucratic centralisation. A great lawyer of those days says, that after the treaties of Westphalia had recognised the territorial supremacy over religion, the business of administration in the German States increased tenfold. Whilst that system remained in its integrity, there could be no peaceful neighbourhood between Catholics and Protestants. From this point of view, the protest of the Pope was entirely justified. So far from having been made in the spirit of the medieval authority, which would have been fatal to the work of the Congress, it was never used by any Catholic prince to invalidate the treaties. They took advantage of the law in their own territories to exercise the *jus reformandi*. It was not possible for them to tolerate a body which still refused to tolerate the Catholic religion by the side of its own, which accordingly eradicated it wherever it had the means, and whose theory made the existence of every religion depend on the power and the will of the sovereign. A system which so resolutely denied that two religions could coexist in the same state put every attempt at mutual toleration out of the question. The Reformation was a great movement against the freedom of conscience,—an effort to subject it to a new authority, the arbitrary initiative of a prince who might differ in religion from all his subjects. The extermination of obstinate Catholics was a matter of course; Melancthon insisted that the Anabaptists should be put to death; and Beza was of opinion that Anti-Trinitarians ought to be executed, even after recantation. But no Lutheran could complain when the secular arm converted him into a Calvinist. "Your conscience is in error," he would say; "but under the circumstances you are not only justified, but compelled, on my own principles, to act as you do."*

* So late as 1791 Pius VI. wrote: "Discrimen intercedit inter homines, qui extra premium Ecclesiæ semper fuerunt, quales sunt Infideles atque Judæi,

The resistance of the Catholic governments to the progress of a religion which announced that it would destroy them as soon as it had the power, was an instinct of self-preservation. No Protestant divine denied or disguised the truth that his party sought the destruction of Catholicism, and would accomplish it whenever they could. The Calvinists, with their usual fearless consistency, held that as civil and ecclesiastical power must be in the same hands, no prince had any right to govern who did not belong to them. Even in the Low Countries, where other sects were free, and the notion of unity abandoned, the Catholics were oppressed.

This new and aggressive intolerance infected even Catholic countries, where there was neither, as in Spain, religious unity to be preserved, nor, as in Austria, a menacing danger to be resisted. For in Spain the persecution of the Protestants might be defended on the medieval principle of unity, whilst under Ferdinand II. it was provoked in the hereditary dominions by the imminent peril which threatened to dethrone the monarch, and to ruin every faithful Catholic. But in France the Protestant doctrine that every good subject must follow the religion of his king grew out of the intensity of personal absolutism. At the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the official argument was the will of the sovereign,—an argument which in Germany had reigned so triumphantly that a single town, which had ten times changed masters, changed its religion ten times in a century. Bayle justly reproaches the Catholic clergy of France with having permitted, and even approved, a proceeding so directly contrary to the spirit of their religion, and to the wishes of the Pope. A convert, who wrote a book to prove that Huguenots were in conscience bound to obey the royal edict which prescribed their worship, met with applause a hundred years later. This fault of the French clergy was expiated in the blood of their successors.

The excess of evil led to its gradual cure. In England Protestantism lost its vigour after the victory over the Catholic dynasty; religion faded away, and with it that religious zeal which leads to persecution: when the religious antagonism was no longer kept alive by a political controversy, the sense of right and the spirit of freedom

atque inter illos qui se Ecclesiæ ipsi per susceptum baptismi sacramentum subjecerunt. Primi enim constringi ad catholicam obedientiam non debent; contra vero alteri sunt cogendi." If this theory had, like that of the Protestants, been put in practice by the governments, it would have furnished the Protestants with an argument precisely similar to that by which the Catholics justified the severity they exercised towards them.

which belong to the Anglo-Saxon race accomplished the work which indifference had begun. In Germany the vitality of the Lutheran theology expired after it had lasted for about two hundred years. The intellectual contradictions and the social consequences of the system had become intolerable to the German mind. Rationalism had begun to prevail, when Frederick II. declared that his subjects should work out their salvation in their own way. That generation of men, who looked with contempt on religious zeal, looked with horror on religious persecution. The Catholic Church, which had never taught that princes are supreme over the religion of their subjects, could have no difficulty in going along with public opinion when it disapproved of compulsion in matters of conscience. It was natural that in the new order of things, when Christendom had lost its unity, and Protestantism its violence, she should revert to the position she occupied of old, when she admitted other religions to equal rights with herself, and when men like St. Ambrose, St. Martin, and St. Leo, deprecated the use of violence against heretics. Nevertheless, as the preservation of morality depends on the preservation of faith, both alike are in the interest and within the competence of the State. The Church of her own strength is not strong enough to resist the advance of heresy and unbelief. Those enemies find an auxiliary in the breast of every man whose weakness and whose passions repel him from a Church which imposes such onerous duties on her members. But it is neither possible to define the conditions without which liberty must be fatal to the State, nor the limits beyond which protection and repression become tyrannical, and provoke a reaction more terrible than the indifference of the civil power. The events of the last hundred years have tended in most places to mingle Protestants and Catholics together, and to break down the social and political lines of demarcation between them; and time will show the providential design which has brought about this great change.

These are the subjects treated in the first two chapters* on "The Church and the Nations," and on the Papacy in connexion with the universality of Catholicism, as contrasted with the national and political dependence of heresy. The two following chapters pursue the topic farther in a general historical retrospect, which increases in interest and importance as it proceeds from the social to the religious purpose and influence of the Papacy, and from the past to the present time. The third chapter, "The Churches and Civil Liberty,"

examines the effects of Protestantism on civil society; the fourth, entitled "The Churches without a Pope," considers the actual theological and religious fruits of separation from the visible Head of the Church.

The independence of the Church, through that of her Supreme Pontiff, is as nearly connected with political as with religious liberty, since the ecclesiastical system which rejects the Pope logically leads to arbitrary power. Throughout the North of Europe,—in Sweden and Denmark, in Mecklenburg and Pomerania, in Prussia, Saxony, and Brunswick,—the power which the Reformation gave to the State introduced an unmitigated despotism. Every security was removed which protected the people against the abuse of the sovereign power, and the lower against the oppression of the upper class. The crown became, sooner or later, despotic; the peasantry, by a long series of enactments, extending to the end of the seventeenth century, was reduced to servitude; the population grew scanty, and much of the land went out of cultivation. All this is related by the Protestant historians and divines, not in the tone of reluctant admission, but with patriotic indignation, commensurate with the horrors of the truth. In all these countries Lutheran unity subsisted. If Calvinism had ever succeeded in obtaining an equal predominance in the Netherlands, the power of the House of Orange would have become as despotic as that of the Danish or the Prussian sovereigns. But its triumph was impeded by sects, and by the presence of a large Catholic minority, destitute indeed of political rights or religious freedom, but for that very reason removed from the conflicts of parties, and therefore an element of conservatism, and a natural ally of those who resisted the ambition of the Stadtholders. The absence of religious unity baffled their attempts to establish arbitrary power on the victory of Calvinism, and upheld, in conjunction with the brilliant policy abroad, a portion of the ancient freedom. In Scotland, the other home of pure Calvinism, where intolerance and religious tyranny reached a pitch equalled only among the Puritans in America, the perpetual troubles hindered the settlement of a fixed political system, and the restoration of order after the union with England stripped the Presbyterian system of its exclusive supremacy, and opened the way for tolerance and freedom.

Although the political spirit of Anglicanism was as despotic as that of every other Protestant system, circumstances prevented its full development. The Catholic Church had bestowed on the English the great elements of their political

prosperity,—the charter of their liberties, the fusion of the races, and the abolition of villeinage,—that is, personal and general freedom, and national unity. Hence the people were so thoroughly impregnated with Catholicism that the Reformation was imposed on them by foreign troops in spite of an armed resistance; and the imported manufacture of Geneva remained so strange and foreign to them, that no English divine of the sixteenth century enriched it with a single original idea. The new Church, unlike those of the Continent, was the result of an endeavour to conciliate the Catholic disposition of the people, by preserving as far as possible the externals to which they were attached; whilst the queen—who was a Protestant rather by policy than by conviction—desired no greater change than was necessary for her purpose. But the divines whom she placed at the head of the new Church were strict Calvinists, and differed from the Puritans only in their submission to the court. The rapidly-declining Catholic party accepted Anglicanism as the lesser evil; while zealous Protestants deemed that the outward forms ought to correspond to the inward substance, and that Calvinistic doctrines required a Calvinistic constitution. Until the end of the century there was no Anglican theology; and the attempt to devise a system in harmony with the peculiar scheme and design of the institution began with Hooker. The monarch was absolute master in the Church, which had been established as an instrument of royal influence; and the divines acknowledged his right by the theory of passive obedience. The consistent section of the Calvinists was won over for a time by the share which the gentry obtained in the spoils of the Church, and by the welcome concession of the penal laws against her, until at last they found that they had in their intolerance been forging chains for themselves. One thing alone, which our national jurists had recognised in the fifteenth century as the cause and the sign of our superiority over foreign states,—the exclusion of the Roman code, and the unbroken preservation of the common law,—kept England from sinking beneath a despotism as oppressive as that of France or Sweden.

As the Anglican Church under James and Charles was the bulwark of arbitrary power, the popular resistance took the form of ecclesiastical opposition. The Church continued to be so thoroughly committed to the principle of unconditional submission to the power from which it derived its existence, that James II. could reckon on this servile spirit as a means of effecting the subversion of the Establishment; and Defoe reproached the bishops with having led on the king by

their flattery whom they abandoned in the moment of his need. The Revolution, which reduced the royal prerogative, removed the oppressiveness of the royal supremacy. The Established Church was not emancipated from the crown, but the Nonconformists were emancipated from the tyranny of the Established Church. Protestantism, which in the period of its power dragged down by its servility the liberties of the nation, did afterwards, in its decay and disorganisation, by the surrender of its dogmatic as well as of its political principle, promote their recovery and development. It lost its oppressiveness in proportion as it lost its strength, and it ceased to be tyrannical when divines had been forced to give up its fundamental doctrine, and when its unity had been dissolved by the sects. The revival of those liberties which, in the Middle Ages, had taken root under the influence of the Church, coincided with the progress of the Protestant sects, and with the decay of the penal laws. The contrast between the political character of those countries in which Protestantism integrally prevailed, and that of those in which it was divided against itself and could neither establish its system nor work out its consequences, is as strongly marked as the contrast between the politics of Catholic times and those which were introduced by the Reformation. The evil which it wrought in its strength was turned to good by its decline.

Such is the sketch of the effects of the Protestant apostasy in the political order,* considered chiefly in relation to the absence of a supreme ecclesiastical authority independent of political control. It would require far more space to exhibit the positive influence of heretical principles on the social foundations of political life; and the picture would not be complete without showing the contrast exhibited by Catholic States, and tracing their passage from the medieval system under the influence of the reaction against the Reformation. The third chapter covers only a portion of this extensive subject; but it shows the action of the new mode of ecclesiastical government upon the civil order, and proves that the importance of the Papacy is not confined to its religious sphere. It thus prepares the way for the subject discussed in the fourth chapter,† the most comprehensive and elaborate in the book.

Dr. Döllinger begins his survey of the Churches that have renounced the Pope with those of the Eastern schism. The Patriarch of Constantinople, whose ecclesiastical authority is enormous, and whose opportunities of extorting money are

* pp. 93-156.

† pp. 156-490.

so great that he is generally deposed at the end of two or three years, in order that many may succeed each other in the enjoyment of such advantages, serves not as a protection, but as an instrument for the oppression of the Christians. The Greek clergy have been the chief means by which the Turks have kept down both the Greek and the Slavonic population; and the Slaves are by degrees throwing off their influence. Submission to the civil power is so natural in communities separated from the Universal Church, that the Greeks look up to the Turkish authorities as arbiters in ecclesiastical matters. When there was a dispute between Greeks and Armenians respecting the mixture of water with the wine in the chalice, the question was referred for decision to the proper quarter, and the Reis Effendi decided that, wine being condemned by the Koran, water alone might be used. Yet to this pusillanimous and degenerate Church belong the future of European Turkey, and the inheritance of the sinking power of the Turks. The vitality of the dominant race is nearly exhausted, and the Christians—on whose pillage they live—exceed them, in increasing proportions, in numbers, prosperity, intelligence, and enterprise.

The Hellenic Church, obeying the general law of schismatical communities, has exchanged the authority of the patriarch for that of the crown, exercised through a synod, which is appointed on the Russian model by the government. The clergy, disabled for religious purposes by the necessity of providing for their families, have little education and little influence, and have no part in the revival of the Grecian intellect. But the people are attached to their ecclesiastical system, not for religion's sake, for infidelity generally accompanies education, but as the defence of their nationality.

In Russia the Catholic Church is considered heretical because of her teaching on the procession of the Holy Ghost, and schismatical in consequence of the claims of the Pope. In the doctrine of purgatory there is no essential difference; and on this point an understanding could easily be arrived at, if none had an interest in widening the breach. In the seventeenth century, the Russian Church retained so much independence that the Metropolitan of Kiev could hold in check the power of the Czar, and the clergy were the mediators between the people and the nobles or the crown. This influence was swept away by the despotism of Peter the Great; and under Catherine II. the property of the Church was annexed to the crown lands, in order, it was said, to relieve the clergy of the burden of administration. Yet even now the Protestant doctrine that the sovereign is supreme in

all matters of religion has not penetrated among the Russians. But though the Czar does not possess this authority over the national Church, of which he is a member, the Protestant system has conceded it to him in the Baltic provinces. Not only are all children of mixed marriages between Protestants and schismatics brought up in the religion of the latter, by which the gradual decline of Protestantism is provided for, but conversions to Protestantism, even of Jews, Mahometans, and heathens, are forbidden ; and, in all questions of doctrine or of liturgy, the last appeal is to the emperor. The religious despotism usually associated with the Russian monarchy subsists only for the Protestants.

The Russian Church is dumb ; the congregation does not sing, the priest does not preach. The people have no prayer-books, and are therefore confined to the narrow circle of their own religious ideas. Against the cloud of superstition which naturally gathers in a religion of ceremonies, destitute of the means of keeping alive or cultivating the religious sentiments of the people, there is no resource. In spite of the degeneracy of their clergy, which they are unable to feel, the Russians cling with patriotic affection to their Church, and identify its progress and prosperity with the increase of their empire. As it is an exclusively national institution, every war may become a war of religion, and it is the attachment to the Church which creates the longing and the claim to possess the city from which it came. From the Church the empire derives its tendency to expand, and the Czar the hopes of that universal dominion which was promised to him by the synod of Moscow in 1619, and for which a prayer was then appointed. The schismatical clergy of Eastern Europe are the channel of Russian influence, the pioneers of Russian aggression. The political dependence of the Church corresponds to its political influence ; subserviency is the condition of the power it possesses. The certificate of Easter confession and communion is required for every civil act, and is consequently an object of traffic. In like manner, the confessor is bound to betray to the police all the secrets of confession which affect the interest of the government.* In this deplorable state of corruption, servitude, and decay within, and of threatening hostility to Christian civilisation abroad, the Russian Church pays the penalty of its Byzantine descent.

The Established Church and the Sects in England† fur-

* It has even happened that a delinquent has been arrested in the church by the priest to whom he was confessing.

† pp. 190-259.

nish few opportunities of treating points which would be new to our readers. Perhaps the most suggestive portion is the description of the effects of Protestantism on the character and condition of the people. The plunder and oppression of the poor has every where followed the plunder of the Church, which was the guardian and refuge of the poor. The charity of the Catholic clergy aimed not merely at relieving, but at preventing poverty. It was their object not only to give alms, but to give to the lower orders the means of obtaining a livelihood. The Reformation at once checked almsgiving; so that Selden says, in places where twenty pounds a year had been distributed formerly, not a handful of meal was given away in his time, for the wedded clergy could not afford it. The confiscation of the lands, where thousands had tilled the soil under the shadow of the monastery or the church, was followed by a new system of cultivation, which deprived the peasants of their homes. The sheep, men said, were the cause of all the woe; and whole towns were pulled down to make room for them. The prelates of the 16th century lament the decline of charity since the Catholic times; and a divine attributed the growing selfishness and harshness to the doctrine of justification by faith. The alteration in the condition of the poor was followed by severe enactments against vagrancy; and the Protestant legislature, after creating a proletariat, treated it as a crime. The conversion of Sunday into a Jewish Sabbath cut off the holiday amusements and soured the cheerfulness of the population. Music, singing, and dancing, the favourite relaxation of a contented people, disappeared, and, especially after the war in the Low Countries, drunkenness began to prevail among a nation which in earlier times had been reckoned the most sober of Northern Europe. The institution which introduced these changes has become a State, not a national, Church, whose services are more attended by the rich than by the poor.

After describing the various parties in the Anglican system, the decay of its divinity, and the general aversion to theological research, Döllinger concludes that its dissolution is a question of time. No State Church can long subsist in modern society which professes the religion of the minority. Whilst the want of a definite system of doctrine, allowing every clergyman to be the mouth-piece, not of a church, but of a party, drives an increasing portion of the people to join the sects which have a fixed doctrine and allow less independence to their preachers, the great danger which menaces the Church comes from the State itself. The progress of

dissent and of democracy in the legislature will make the Church more and more entirely dependent on the will of the majority, and will drive the best men from the communion of a servile Establishment. The rise and fortunes of Methodism are related with peculiar predilection by the author, who speaks of John Wesley as the greatest intellect English Protestantism has produced, next to Baxter.

The first characteristic of Scottish Presbyterianism is the absence of a theology. The only considerable divines that have appeared in Scotland since the Reformation, Leighton and Forbes, were prelates of the Episcopal Church. Calvinism was unable to produce a theological literature, in spite of the influence of English writers, of the example of Holland, and of the great natural intelligence of the Scots. "Their theology," says a distinguished Lutheran divine, "possesses no system of Christian ethics." This Döllinger attributes to the strictness with which they have held to the doctrine of imputation, which is incompatible with any system of moral theology. In other countries it was the same; where that doctrine prevailed, there was no ethical system, and where ethics were cultivated, the doctrine was abandoned. For a century after Luther, no moral theology was written in Germany. The first who attempted it, Calixtus, gave up the Lutheran doctrine. The Dutch historians of Calvinism in the Netherlands record, in like manner, that there the dread of a collision with the dogma silenced the teaching of ethics both in literature and at the universities. Accordingly, all the great Protestant moralists were opposed to the Protestant doctrine of justification. In Scotland the intellectual lethargy of Churchmen is not confined to the department of ethics; and Presbyterianism only prolongs its existence by suppressing theological writing, and by concealing the contradictions which would otherwise bring down on the clergy the contempt of their flocks.

Whilst Scotland has clung to the original dogma of Calvin, at the price of complete theological stagnation, the Dutch Church has lost its primitive orthodoxy in the progress of theological learning. Not one of the several schools into which the clergy of the Netherlands are divided has remained faithful to the five articles of the synod of Dortrecht, which still command so extensive an allegiance in Great Britain and America. The conservative party, headed by the statesman and historian Groen van Prinsterer, who holds fast to the theology which is so closely interwoven with the history of his country and with the fortunes of the reigning house, and who invokes the aid of the secular arm in support

of pure Calvinism, is not represented at the universities. For all the Dutch divines know that the system cannot be revived without sacrificing the theological activity by which it has been extinguished. The old confessional writings have lost their authority; and the general synod of 1854 decided that, "as it is impossible to reconcile all opinions and wishes, even in the shortest confession, the Church tolerates divergence from the symbolical books." The only unity, says Groen, consists in this, that all the preachers are paid out of the same fund. The bulk of the clergy are Arminians or Socinians. From the spectacle of the Dutch Church Dr. Döllinger comes to the following result: first, that without a code of doctrine laid down in authoritative confessions of faith, the Church cannot endure; secondly, that the old confessional writings cannot be maintained, and are universally given up; and thirdly, that it is impossible to draw up new ones.

French Protestantism suffered less from the Revolution than the Catholic Church, and was treated with tenderness, and sometimes with favour. The dissolution of Continental Protestantism began in France. Before their expulsion in 1685, the French divines had cast off the yoke of the Dortrecht articles, and in their exile they afterwards promoted the decline of Calvinism in the Netherlands. The old Calvinistic tradition has never been restored, the works of the early writers are forgotten, no new theological literature has arisen, and the influence of Germany has borne no considerable fruit. The evangelical party, or Methodists as they are called, are accused by the rest of being the cause of their present melancholy state. The rationalism of the *Indifférens* generally prevails among the clergy, either in the shape of the naturalism of the eighteenth century (Coquerel), or in the more advanced form of modern criticism, as it is carried out by the faculty of Strasburg, with the aid of German infidelity. Payment by the State and hatred of Catholicism are the only common marks of French Protestant divines. They have no doctrine, no discipline, no symbol, no theology. Nobody can define the principle or the limits of their community.

The Calvinism of Switzerland has been ruined in its doctrine by the progress of theology, and in its constitution by the progress of democracy. In Geneva the Church of Calvin fell in the revolutions of 1841 and 1846. The symbolical books are abolished; the doctrine is based on the Bible; but the right of free inquiry is granted to all; the ruling body consists of laymen. "The faith of our fathers," says Merle

d'Aubigné, "counts but a small group of adherents amongst us." In the canton of Vaud, where the whole ecclesiastical power was in the hands of the government, the yoke of the democracy became insupportable, and the excellent writer, Vinet, seceded with 180 ministers out of 250. The people of Berne are among the most bitter enemies of Catholicism in Europe. Their fanaticism crushed the Sonderbund; but the recoil drove them towards infidelity, and hastened the decrease of devotion and of the influence of the clergy. None of the German Swiss, and few of the French, retain in its purity the system of Calvin. The unbelief of the clergy lays the Church open to the attacks of a Cæsaro-papistic democracy. A Swiss Protestant divine said recently: "Only a Church with a Catholic organisation could have maintained itself without a most extraordinary descent of the Holy Spirit against the assaults of Radicalism." "What we want," says another, "in order to have a free Church, is pastors and flocks; dogs and wolves there are in plenty."

In America it is rare to find people who are openly irreligious. Except some of the Germans, all Protestants generally admit the truth of Christianity and the authority of Scripture. But above half of the American population belongs to no particular sect, and performs no religious functions. This is the result of the voluntary principle, of the dominion of the sects, and of the absence of an established Church, to receive each individual from his birth, to adopt him by baptism, and to bring him up in the atmosphere of a religious life. The majority of men will naturally take refuge in indifference and neutrality from the conflict of opinions, and will persuade themselves that where there are so many competitors, none can be the lawful spouse. Yet there is a blessing on every thing that is Christian, which can never be entirely effaced or converted into a curse. Whatever the imperfections of the form in which it exists, the errors mixed up with it, or the degrading influence of human passion, Christianity never ceases to work immeasurable social good. But the great theological characteristic of American Protestantism is the absence of the notion of the Church. The prevailing belief is, that in times past there was always a war of opinions and of parties, that there never was one unbroken vessel, and that it is necessary, therefore, to put up with fragments, one of which is nearly as good as another. Sectarianism, it is vaguely supposed, is the normal condition of religion. Now a sect is, by its very nature, instinctively adverse to a scientific theology; it feels that it is short-lived, without a history, and unconnected with the main stream of

ecclesiastical progress, and it is inspired with hatred and with contempt for the past, for its teaching and its writings. Practically, sectaries hold that a tradition is the more surely to be rejected the older it is, and the more valuable in proportion to the lateness of its origin. As a consequence of the want of roots in the past, and of the thirst for novelty, the history of those sects which are not sunk in lethargy consists in sudden transitions to opposite extremes. In the religious world ill weeds grow apace; and those communities which strike root, spring up, and extend most rapidly, are the least durable and the least respectable. The sects of Europe were transplanted into America; but there the impatience of authority, which is the basis of social and political life, has produced in religion a variety and a multiplicity, of which Europe has no experience.

Whilst these are the fruits of religious liberty and ecclesiastical independence among a people generally educated, the Danish monarchy exhibits unity of faith strictly maintained by keeping the people under the absolute control of the upper class, on whose behalf the Reformation was introduced, and in a state of ignorance corresponding to their oppression. Care was taken that they should not obtain religious instruction, and in the beginning of the eighteenth century the celebrated Bishop Pontoppidan says, "an almost heathen blindness pervades the land." About the same time the Norwegian prelates declared, in a petition to the King of Denmark: "If we except a few children of God, there is only this difference between us and our heathen ancestors, that we bear the name of Christians." The Danish Church has given no signs of life, and has shown no desire for independence since the Reformation; and in return for this submissiveness, the government suppressed every tendency towards dissent. Things were not altered when the tyranny of the nobles gave way to the tyranny of the crown; but when the revolution of 1848 had given the state a democratic basis, its confessional character was abrogated, and whilst Lutheranism was declared the national religion, conformity was no longer exacted. The king is still the head of the Church, and is the only man in Denmark who must be a Lutheran. No form of ecclesiastical government suitable to the new order of things has yet been devised, and the majority prefer to remain in the present provisional state, subject to the will of a parliament, not one member of which need belong to the Church which it governs. Among the clergy, those who are not Rationalists follow the lead of Grundtvig. During many years this able man has conducted an incessant resist-

ance against the progress of unbelief and of the German influence, and against the Lutheran system, the royal supremacy, and the parochial constitution. Not unlike the Tractarians, he desires the liberty of establishing a system which shall exclude Lutheranism, Rationalism, and Erastianism; and he has united in his school nearly all who profess positive Christianity in Denmark. In Copenhagen, out of 150,000 inhabitants, only 6000 go regularly to church. In Altona, there is but one church for 45,000 people. In Schleswig the churches are few and empty. "The great evil," says a Schleswig divine, "is not the oppression which falls on the German tongue, but the irreligion and consequent demoralisation which Denmark has imported into Schleswig. A moral and religious tone is the exception, not the rule, among the Danish clergy."

The theological literature of Sweden consists almost entirely of translations from the German. The clergy, by renouncing study, have escaped Rationalism, and remain faithful to the Lutheran system. The king is supreme in spirituals, and the Diet discusses and determines religious questions. The clergy, as one of the estates, have great political influence, but no ecclesiastical independence. No other Protestant clergy possesses equal privileges or less freedom. It is usual for the minister after the sermon to read out a number of trivial local announcements, sometimes half an hour long; and in a late assembly the majority of the Bishops pronounced in favour of retaining this custom, as none but old women and children would come to church for the service alone. In no other country in Europe is the strict Lutheran system preached but in Sweden. The doctrine is preserved, but religion is dead, and the Church is as silent and as peaceful as the churchyard. The Church is richly endowed; there are great universities, and Swedes are among the foremost in almost every branch of science; but no Swedish writer has ever done any thing for religious thought. The example of Denmark and its Rationalist clergy brought home to them the consequences of theological study. In one place the old system has been preserved, like a frail and delicate curiosity, by excluding the air of scientific inquiry, whilst in the other Lutheranism is decomposing under its influence. In Norway, where the clergy have no political representation, religious liberty was established in 1844.

Throughout the north of Europe the helpless decline of Protestantism is betrayed by the numerical disproportion of preachers to the people. Norway, with a population of

1,500,000, thinly scattered over a very large territory, has 485 parishes, with an average of 3600 souls a piece. But the clergy are pluralists, and as many as five parishes are often united under a single incumbent. Holstein has only 192 preachers for an almost exclusively Lutheran population of 544,000. In Schleswig many parishes have been deserted because they were too poor to maintain a clergyman's family. Sometimes there are only two ministers for 13,000 persons. In the Baltic provinces the proportion is one to 4394. In this way the people have to bear the burden of a clergy with families to support.

The most brilliant and important part of this chapter is devoted to the state of Protestantism in the author's native country.* He speaks with the greatest authority and effect when he comes near home, describes the opinions of men who have been his rivals in literature, or his adversaries in controversy, and touches on discussions which his own writings have influenced. There is a difference also in the tone. When he speaks of the state of other countries, with which he has made himself acquainted as a traveller, or through the writings of others, he preserves the calmness and objectivity of a historian, and adds few reflections to the simple description of facts. But in approaching the scenes and the thoughts of his own country, the interests and the most immediate occupations of his own life, the familiarity of long experience gives greater confidence, warmth, and vigour to his touch; the historian gives way to the divine, and the narrative sometimes slides into theology. Besides the position of the author, the difference of the subject justifies a change in the treatment. The examination of Protestantism in the rest of the world pointed with monotonous uniformity to a single conclusion. Every where there was the same spectacle and the same alternative: either religion sacrificed to the advancement of learning, or learning relinquished for the preservation of religion. Every where the same antagonism between intellectual progress and fidelity to the fundamental doctrines of Protestantism. Either religion has become stark and stagnant in states which protect unity by the proscription of knowledge, or the progress of thought and inquiry has undermined belief in the Protestant system, and driven its professors from one untenable position to another, or the ascendancy of the sectarian spirit has been equally fatal to its dogmatic integrity and to its intellectual development. But in the home of the Reformation a league has been concluded in our time between theo-

logy and religion, and many schools of Protestant divines are labouring, with a vast expenditure of ability and learning, to devise, or to restore, with the aid of theological science, a system of positive Christianity. Into this great scene of intellectual exertion and doctrinal confusion the leading adversary of Protestantism in Germany conducts his readers, not without sympathy for the high aims which inspire the movement, but with the almost triumphant security which belongs to a Church possessing an acknowledged authority, a definite organisation, and a system brought down by tradition from the apostolic age. Passing by the schools of infidelity, which have no bearing on the topic of his work, he addresses himself to the believing Protestantism of Germany, and considers its efforts to obtain a position which may enable it to resist unbelief without involving submission to the Church.

The character of Luther separates the German Protestants from those of other countries. His was the master-spirit, in whom his contemporaries beheld the incarnation of the genius of their nation. In the strong lineaments of his character they recognised, in heroic proportions, the reflection of their own ; and thus his name has survived, not merely as that of a great man, the mightiest of his age, but as the type of a whole period in the history of the German people, the centre of a new world of ideas, the personification of those religious and ethical opinions which the country followed, and whose influence even their adversaries could not escape. His writings have long ceased to be popular, and are read only as monuments of history ; but the memory of his person has not yet grown dim. His name is still a power in his own country, and from its magic the Protestant doctrine derives a portion of its life. In other countries men dislike to be described by the name of the founder of their religious system ; but in Germany and Sweden there are thousands who are proud of the name of Lutheran.

The results of his system prevail in the more influential and intelligent classes, and penetrate the mass of the modern literature of Germany. The Reformation had introduced the notion that Christianity was a failure, and had brought far more suffering than blessings on mankind ; and the consequences of that movement were not calculated to impress educated men with the belief that things were changed for the better, or that the Reformers had achieved the work in which the Apostles were unsuccessful. Thus an atmosphere of unbelief and of contempt for every thing Christian gradually arose, and Paganism appeared more

cheerful, more human, and more poetical, than the repulsive Galilean doctrine of holiness and privation. This spirit still governs the educated class. Christianity is abominated both in life and in literature, even under the form of believing Protestantism.

In Germany theological study and the Lutheran system subsisted for two centuries together. The controversies that arose from time to time developed the theory, but brought out by degrees its inward contradictions. The danger of biblical studies was well understood, and the Scriptures were almost universally excluded from the Universities in the seventeenth century; but in the middle of the eighteenth Bengel revived the study of the Bible, and the dissolution of the Lutheran doctrine began. The rise of historical learning hastened the process. Frederic the Great says of himself, that the notion that the history of the Church is a drama, conducted by rogues and hypocrites, at the expense of the deceived masses, was the real cause of his contempt for the Christian religion. The Lutheran theology taught, that after the Apostolic age God withdrew from the Church, and abandoned to the devil the office which, according to the Gospel, was reserved for the Holy Spirit. This diabolical millennium lasted till the appearance of Luther. As soon, therefore, as the reverence for the symbolical books began to wane, the belief in the divine foundation departed with the belief in the divine guidance of the Church, and the root was judged by the stem, the beginning by the continuation. As research went on, unfettered now by the authorities of the sixteenth century, the clergy became Rationalists, and stone after stone of the temple was carried away by its own priests. The infidelity which at the same time flourished in France, did not, on the whole, infect the priesthood. But in Germany it was the divines who destroyed religion, the pastors who impelled their flocks to renounce the Christian faith.

In 1817 the Prussian Union added a new Church to the two original forms of Protestantism. But strict Calvinism is nearly extinct in Germany, and the old Lutheran Church itself has almost disappeared. It subsists, not in any definite reality, but only in the aspirations of certain divines and jurists. The purpose of the union was to bring together, in religious communion, the reigning family of Prussia, which had adopted Calvinism in 1613, and the vast Lutheran majority among the people. It was to be, in the words of the king, a merely ritual union, not an amalgamation of dogmas. In some places there was resistance, which was put down by

military execution. Some thousands emigrated to America; but the public press applauded the measures, and there was no general indignation at their severity. The Lutherans justly perceived that the union would promote religious indifference: but at the accession of the late king there came a change. Religious faith was once more sought after; believing professors were appointed in almost all the German Universities, after the example of Prussia; Jena and Giessen alone continued to be seats of Rationalism. As soon as theology had begun to recover a more religious and Christian character, two very divergent tendencies manifested themselves. Among the disciples of Schleiermacher and of Neander a school of unionists arose who attempted a conciliatory intermediate theology. At the same time a strictly Lutheran theology flourished at the Universities of Erlangen, Leipzig, Rostock, and Dorpat, which sought to revive the doctrine of the sixteenth century, clothed in the language of the nineteenth. But for men versed in Scripture theology this was an impossible enterprise, and it was abandoned by the divines to a number of parochial clergymen, who are represented in literature by Rudelbach, and who claim to be the only surviving Protestants whom Luther would acknowledge as his sons and the heirs of his spirit.

The Lutheran divines and scholars formed the new Lutheran party,* whose most illustrious lay champion was the celebrated Stahl. They profess the Lutheran doctrine of justification, but reject the notion of the invisible Church and the universal priesthood. Holding to the divine institution of the offices of the Church, in opposition to the view which refers them to the congregation, they are led to assume a sacrament of orders, and to express opinions on ordination, sacraments, and sacrifice, which involve them in the imputation of Puseyism, or even of Catholicism. As they remain for the most part in the State Church, there is an open war between their confessional spirit and the syncretism of the union. In 1857 the Evangelical Alliance met at Berlin in order to strengthen the unionist principles, and to testify against these Pharisees. Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians,—sects connected by nothing but a common hatred of Catholicism,—were greeted by the union divines as bone of their bone, and welcome allies in the contest with an exclusive Lutheranism and with Rome. The confusion in the minds of the people was increased by this spectacle. The union already implied that the dogma of the Lord's

* The works contained in Clarke's Library of Translations are chiefly of this school.

Supper, on which Lutherans and Calvinists disagree, was uncertain, and therefore not essential. The alliance of so many denominations added baptism to the list of things about which nothing is positively known. The author of this measure was Bunsen, who was full of the idea of uniting all Protestant sects in a union against the Catholic Church and catholicising tendencies.

For the last fifteen years there has been an active agitation for the improvement of the Church among the Protestant divines. The first question that occupies and divides them is that of Church government and the royal episcopate, which many deem the chief cause of the ecclesiastical decay. The late King of Prussia, a zealous and enlightened friend of the Protestant Church, declared that "the territorial system, and the episcopal authority of the sovereign, are of such a nature that either of them would alone be enough to kill the Church if the Church was mortal," and that he longed to be able to abdicate his rights into the hands of the Bishops. In other countries, as in Baden, a new system has been devised, which transfers political constitutionalism to the Church, and makes it a community, not of those who believe in Christ, but, in the words of the government organ, of those who believe in a moral order. Hopes were entertained that the introduction of synods would be an improvement, and in 1856 and 1857 a beginning was made at Berlin; but it was found that the existence of great evils and disorders in the Church, which had been a secret of the initiated, would be published to the world, and that government by majorities, the ecclesiastical democracy which was Bunsen's ideal, would soon destroy every vestige of Christianity.

In their doctrinal and theological literature resides at the present day the strength and the renown of the Protestants; for a scientific Protestant theology exists only in Germany. The German Protestant Church is emphatically a Church of theologians; they are its only authority, and, through the princes, its supreme rulers. Its founder never really divested himself of the character of a professor, and the Church has never emancipated itself from the lecture-room: it teaches, and then disappears. Its hymns are not real hymns, but versified theological dissertations, or sermons in rhyme. Born of the union of princes with professors, it retains the distinct likeness of both its parents, not altogether harmoniously blended; and when it is accused of worldliness, of paleness of thought, of being a police institution rather than a Church, that is no more than to say that the child cannot deny its parentage.

Theology has become believing in Germany, but it is very far from being orthodox. No writer is true to the literal teaching of the symbolical books, and for a hundred years the pure doctrine of the sixteenth century has never been heard. No German divine could submit to the authority of the early articles and formulas without hypocrisy and violence to his conscience, and yet they have nothing else to appeal to. That the doctrine of justification by faith only is the principal substance of the symbolical writings, the centre of the antagonism against the Catholic Church, all are agreed. The neo-Lutherans proclaim it "the essence and treasure of the Reformation," "the doctrine of which every man must have a clear and vivid comprehension, who would know any thing of Christianity," "the banner which must be unfurled at least once in every sermon," "the permanent death that gnaws the bones of Catholics," "the standard by which the whole of the gospel must be interpreted, and every obscure passage explained;" and yet this article of a standing or falling Church, on the strength of which Protestants call themselves evangelical, is accepted by scarcely one of their more eminent divines, even among the Lutherans. The progress of biblical studies is too great to admit of a return to the doctrine which has been exploded by the advancement of religious learning. Dr. Döllinger gives a list (p. 430) of the names of the leading theologians, by all of whom it has been abandoned. Yet it was for the sake of this fundamental and essential doctrine that the epistle of St. James was pronounced an epistle of straw, that the Augsburg Confession declared it to have been the belief of St. Augustine, and that when the author of the Confession had for very shame omitted this falsehood in the published edition, the passage was restored after his death. For its sake Luther deliberately altered the sense of several passages in the Bible, especially in the writings of St. Paul. To save this doctrine, which was unknown to all Christian antiquity, the breach was made with all ecclesiastical tradition, and the authority of the dogmatic testimony of the Church in every age was rejected. While the contradiction between the Lutheran doctrine and that of the first centuries was disguised before the laity, it was no secret among the Reformers. Melancthon confessed to Breuz, that in the Augsburg Confession he had lied. Luther admitted that his theory was new, and sought in consequence to destroy the authority of the early Fathers and Councils. Calvin declared that the system was unknown to tradition. All these men and their disciples, and the whole of the Lutheran and Calvinistic

theology of the sixteenth and seventeenth century, professed to find their doctrine of imputation laid down distinctly in the Bible. The whole modern scientific theology of the Protestants rejects both the doctrine and the Lutheran exegesis of the passages in question. But it is the supreme evangelical principle, that the Scripture is perfectly clear and sufficient on all fundamental points. Yet the point on which this great divergence subsists is a doctrine which is decisive for the existence of the Church, and most important in its practical influence on life. The whole edifice of the Protestant Church and theology reposes therefore on two principles; one material, the other formal; the doctrine of imputation, and the sufficiency of the Bible. But the material principle is given up by exegesis and by dogmatic theology; and as to the formal principle, for the sufficiency of the Bible, or even for the inspiration of the writings of the disciples of the Apostles, not the shadow of a scriptural argument can be adduced. The significance of this great fact is beginning to make its way. "Whilst Rationalism prevailed," says a famous Lutheran divine, "we could impute to its action that our churches were deserted and empty. But now that Christ crucified is every where preached, and no serious effect is to be observed, it is necessary to abandon this mistake, and not to conceal from ourselves that preaching is unable to revive religious life."

The religious indifference of the educated classes is the chief security for the existence of the Protestant Church. If they were to take an interest in matters of worship and doctrine, and to inform themselves as to the present relation of theological science to the teaching of the pulpit, the day of discovery and exposure would come, and confidence in the Church would be at an end. The dishonesty of Luther in those very things on which the Reformation depended could not be concealed from them. In Prussia there was a conscientious clergyman who taught his parishioners Greek, and then showed them all the passages, especially in the Epistles of St. Paul, which were intentionally altered in the translation. But one of the Protestant leaders impresses on the clergy the danger of allowing the people to know that which ought to be kept a secret among the learned. At most, he says, it may be necessary to admit that the translation is not perspicuous. The danger of this discovery does not, however, appear to be immediate, for no book is less familiar to the laity than the Bible. "There is scarcely one Christian family in a hundred," says Tholuck, "in which the Holy Scriptures are read."

In the midst of this general downfall of Christianity in spite of the great efforts of Protestants, some take refuge in the phrase of an invisible Church, some in a Church of the future. Whilst there exists a real living universal Church with a settled system and means of salvation, an invisible Church is offered in her stead, wrapped up in the swaddling clothes of rhetoric, like the stone which Rhea gave her husband instead of the child. In a novel of Jean Paul, a Swedish clergyman is advised in the middle of winter to walk about with a bit of orange-sugar in his mouth, in order to realise with all his senses the sunny climes of the south. It requires as much imagination to realise the Church by taking a "spiritual league" into one's mouth.

Another acknowledgment, that the Church has become estranged from the people, and subsists only as a ruin of a past age, is the widely spread hope of a new Pentecost. Eminent theologians speak of it as the only conceivable salvation; though there is no such promise in Scripture, no example in history of a similar desire. They rest their only hope in a miracle, such as has not happened since the Apostles, and thereby confess that, in the normal process of religious life by which Christ has guided His Church till now, their cause is lost. A symptom of the same despair is the rise of chiliastic aspirations, and the belief in the approaching end of the world. To this party belongs the present minister of public worship and education in Berlin. Shortly before his appointment he wrote: "Both Church and State must perish in their earthly forms, that the kingdom of Christ may be set up over all nations, that the bride of the Lamb, the perfect community, the new Jerusalem, may descend from heaven." Not long before this was published, another Prussian statesman, Bunsen, had warned his Protestant readers to turn away from false prophets, who announce the end of the world because they have come to the end of their own wisdom.

In the midst of this desperate weakness, although Catholics and Protestants are so mixed up with each other that toleration must soon be universal throughout Germany, the thoughts of the Protestants are yet not turned towards the Catholic Church; they still show a bitter animosity against her, and the reproach of Catholic tendencies has for twenty years been the strongest argument against every attempt to revive religion and worship. The attitude of Protestantism towards Rome, says Stahl, is that of the Borghese gladiator. To soften this spirit of animosity, the only possible resource is to make it clear to all Protestants who still

hold to Christianity, what their own internal condition is, and what they have come to by their rejection of the unity and the authority which the Catholic Church possesses in the Holy See. Having shown the value of the Papacy by the results which have ensued on its rejection, Döllinger proceeds, with the same truth and impartiality, to trace the events which have injured the influence and diminished the glory and attractiveness of the Holy See, and have converted that which should be the safeguard of its spiritual freedom into a calamity and a dishonour in the eyes of mankind. It seems as though he wished to point out, as the moral to be learnt from the present condition of the religious world, that there is a coincidence in time and in providential purpose between the exhaustion and the despair at which enlightened Protestantism has arrived, from the failure of every attempt to organise a form of church-government, to save the people from infidelity, and to reconcile theological knowledge with their religious faith,—between this and that great drama which, by destroying the bonds which linked the Church to an untenable system, is preparing the restoration of the Holy See to its former independence, and to its just influence over the minds of men.

The Popes, after obtaining a virtual independence under the Byzantine sceptre, transferred their allegiance to the revived empire of the West. The line between their authority and that of the emperor in Rome was never clearly drawn. It was a security for the freedom and regularity of the election, which was made by the lay as well as ecclesiastical dignitaries of the city, that it should be subject to the imperial ratification ; but the remoteness of the emperors, and the inconvenience of delay, caused this rule to be often broken. This prosperous period did not long continue. When the dynasty of Charlemagne came to an end, the Roman clergy had no defence against the nobles, and the Romans did all that men could do to ruin the Papacy. There was little remaining of the state which the Popes had formed in conjunction with the emperors. In the middle of the tenth century exarchate and Pentapolis were in the power of Berengarius, and Rome in the hands of the senator Alberic. Alberic, understanding that a secular principality could not last long, obtained the election of his son Octavian, who became Pope John XII. Otho the Great, who had restored the empire, and claimed to exercise its old prerogative, deposed the new Pope ; and when the Romans elected another, sent him also into exile beyond the Alps. For a whole century after this time there was no trace of freedom of election.

Without the emperor, the Popes were in the hands of the Roman factions, and dependence on the emperor was better for the Church than dependence on the nobles. The Popes appointed under the influence of the prelates, who were the ecclesiastical advisers of the imperial government, were preferable to the nominees of the Roman chiefs, who had no object or consideration but their own ambition, and were inclined to speculate on the worthlessness of their candidates. During the first half of the eleventh century they recovered their predominance, and the deliverance of the Church came once more from Germany. A succession of German Popes, named by the emperor, opened the way for the permanent reform which is associated with the name of Gregory VII. Up to this period the security of the freedom of the Holy See was the protection of the emperor, and Gregory was the last Pope who asked for the imperial confirmation.

Between the middle of the ninth century and the middle of the eleventh the greater part of the Roman territory had passed into the hands of laymen. Some portions were possessed by the emperor, some by the great Italian families, and the revenues of the Pope were derived from the tribute of his vassals. Sylvester II. complains that this was very small, as the possessions of the Church had been given away for very little. Besides the tribute, the vassals owed feudal service to the Pope; but the government was not in his hands, and the imperial suzerainty remained. The great families had obtained from the Popes of their making such extensive grants that there was little remaining, and Otho III. tried to make up for it by a new donation. The loss of the patrimonies in Southern Italy established a claim on the Norman conquerors, and they became papal vassals for the kingdom of Sicily. But throughout the twelfth century the Popes had no firm basis of their power in Italy. They were not always masters of Rome, and there was not a single provincial town they could reckon on. Seven Popes in a hundred years sought a refuge in France; two remained at Verona. The donation of Matilda was disputed by the emperors, and brought no material accession of territory, until Innocent III., with his usual energy, secured to the Roman Church the south of Tuscany. He was the first Pope who governed a considerable territory, and became the real founder of the States of the Church. Before him the Popes had possessions for which they claimed tribute and service, but no state that they administered. Innocent obtained the submission of Benevento and Romagna. He left the towns to govern themselves by their own laws, demanding only

military aid in case of need, and a small tribute, which was not always exacted. Viterbo, for instance, paid nothing until the fifteenth century.

The contest with Frederic II. stripped the Holy See of most of these acquisitions. In many cases its civil authority was no longer acknowledged; in many it became a mere title of honour, while the real power had passed into the hands of the towns or of the nobles; sometimes into those of the Bishops. Rodolph of Habsburg restored all that had been lost, and surrendered the imperial claims. But while the German influence was suspended, the influence of France prevailed over the Papacy; and during the exile at Avignon the Popes were as helpless as if they had possessed not an acre of their own in Italy. It was during their absence that the Italian Republics fell under the Tyrannis, and their dominions were divided among a swarm of petty princes. The famous expedition of Cardinal Albornoz put an end to these disorders. He recovered the territories of the Church, and became, by the *Ægidian Constitutions*, which survived for ages, the legislator of Romagna. In 1376 eighty towns rose up in the space of three days, declared themselves free, or recalled the princes whom Albornoz had expelled. Before they could be reduced, the schism broke out, and the Church learnt the consequences of the decline of the empire and the disappearance of its advocacy and protectorate over the Holy See. Boniface IX. sold to the republics and the princes, for a sum of money and an annual tribute, the ratification of the rights which they had seized.

The first great epoch in the history of the temporal power after the schism is the election of Eugene IV. He swore to observe a statute which had been drawn up in Conclave, by which all vassals and officers of state were to swear allegiance to the College of Cardinals in conjunction with the Pope. As he also undertook to abandon to the Cardinals half the revenue, he shared in fact his authority with them. This was a new form of government, and a great restriction of the papal power; but it did not long endure.

The centrifugal tendency, which broke up Italy into small principalities, had long prevailed, when at last the Popes gave way to it. The first was Sixtus IV., who made one of his nephews lord of Imola, and another of Sinigaglia. Alexander VI. subdued all the princes in the States of the Church except the Duke of Montefeltro, and intended to make the whole an hereditary monarchy for his son. But Julius II. recovered all these conquests for the Church, added new ones to them, and thus became, after Innocent III.

and Albornoz, the third founder of the Roman State. The age which beheld this restoration was marked in almost every country by the establishment of political unity on the ruins of the medieval independence, and of monarchical absolutism at the expense of medieval freedom. Both of these tendencies asserted themselves in the States of the Church. The liberties of the towns were gradually destroyed. This was accomplished by Clement VII. in Ancona, in 1532; by Paul III. in Perugia, in 1540. Ravenna, Faenza, Jesi, had, under various pretexts, undergone the same fate. By the middle of the sixteenth century, all resistance was subdued. In opposition, however, to this centralising policy, the nepotism introduced by Sixtus IV. led to dismemberment. Paul III. gave Parma and Piacenza to his son Pier Luigi Farnese, and the duchy was lost to the Holy See for good. Paul IV. made a similar attempt in favour of his nephew Caraffa, but he was put to death under Pius IV.; and this species of nepotism, which subsisted at the expense of the papal territory, came to an end. Pius V. forbade, under pain of excommunication, to invest any one with a possession of the Holy See, and this law was extended even to temporary concessions.

In the eighteenth century a time came when the temporal power was a source of weakness, and a weapon by which the courts compelled the Pope to consent to measures he would otherwise never have approved. It was thus that the suppression of the Jesuits was obtained from Clement XIV. Under his successors the world had an opportunity of comparing the times when Popes like Alexander III. or Innocent IV. governed the Church from their exile, and now, when men of the greatest piety and conscientiousness virtually postponed their duty as head of the Church to their rights as temporal sovereigns, and, like the senators of old, awaited the Gauls upon their throne. There is a lesson not to be forgotten in the contrast between the policy and the fate of the great medieval Pontiffs, who preserved their liberty by abandoning their dominions, and that of Pius VI. and Pius VII., who preferred captivity to flight.

The nepotism of Urban VIII. brought on the war of Castro, and in its train increase of debt, of taxes, impoverishment of the State, and the odious union of spiritual with temporal arms, which became a permanent calamity for the Holy See. This attachment to the interest of their families threw great discredit on the Popes, who were dishonoured by the faults, the crimes, and the punishment of their relatives. But since the death of Alexander VIII., in 1691,

even that later form of nepotism which aimed at wealth only, not at political power, came to an end, and has never reappeared except in the case of the Braschi. The nepotism of the cardinals and prelates has survived that of the Popes. If the statute of Eugene IV. had remained in force, the College of Cardinals would have formed a wholesome restraint in the temporal government, and the favouritism of the papal relations would have been prevented. But the Popes acted with the absolute power which was in the spirit of the monarchies of that age. When Paul IV. announced to the Sacred College that he had stripped the house of Colonna of its possessions to enrich his nephew, and that he was at war with Spain, they listened in silence, and have been passive ever since. No European sovereignty enjoyed so arbitrary an authority. Under Julius II. the towns retained considerable privileges, and looked on their annexation to the Papal State as a deliverance from their former oppressors. Machiavelli and Guicciardini say that the Popes required neither to defend nor to administer their dominions, and that the people were content in the enjoyment of their autonomy. In the course of the sixteenth century the administration was gradually centralised in Rome, and placed in the hands of ecclesiastics. Before 1550 the governors were ordinarily laymen, but the towns themselves preferred to be governed by prelates. By the close of the century the independence of the corporations had disappeared; but the centralisation, though complete, was not vigorous, and practically the towns and the barons, though not free, were not oppressed.

The modern system of government in the Roman States originated with Sixtus V. He introduced stability and regularity in the administration, and checked the growth of nepotism, favouritism, and arbitrary power, by the creation of permanent congregations. In connexion with this measure the prelates became the upper class of official persons in the State, and were always expected to be men of fortune. A great burden for the country was the increase of offices, which were created only to be sold. No important duties and no fixed salary were attached to them, and the incumbent had to rely on fees and extortion. In the year 1470 there were 650 places of this kind. In eighty years they had increased to 3500. The theory was, that the money raised by the sale of places saved the people from the imposition of new taxes. Innocent XII., in 1693, put an end to this traffic; but it had continued so long that the ill effects survived.

There was a great contrast between the ecclesiastical administration, which exhibited a dignified stability, resting on fixed rules and ancient traditions, and the civil government, which was exposed to continual fluctuation by the change of persons, of measures, and of systems; for few Popes continued the plans of their predecessors. The new Pontiff commenced his reign generally with a profound sense of the abuses and of the discontent which prevailed before his elevation, and naturally sought to obtain favour and improvement by opposite measures. In the cultivation of the Roman Campagna, for instance, it was observed that each Pope followed a different system, so that little was accomplished. The persons were almost always changed by the new Pope, so that great offices rarely remained long in the same hands. The Popes themselves were seldom versed in affairs of state, and therefore required the assistance of statesmen of long experience. In the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries, when the election was free from outward influence, men were generally chosen who had held under one or two Popes the highest office of state,—Gregory VII., Urban II., Gelasius II., Lucius II., Alexander III., Gregory VIII., Gregory IX., Alexander IV. But in modern times it has been the rule that the secretary of state should not be elected, and that the new Pope should dismiss the heads of the administration. Clement IX. was the first who gave up this practice, and retained almost all those who had been employed under his predecessor.

The burdens of the state increased far beyond its resources from the aid which the Popes gave to the Catholic powers, especially in the Turkish wars. At the beginning of the seventeenth century the debt amounted to 12,242,620 scudi, and the interest absorbed three-fourths of the whole income. In 1655 it had risen to 48,000,000 scudi. The financial administration was secret, free from the control of public accounts, and the Tesoriere, being necessarily a cardinal, was irresponsible. There was no industry in the towns; they remained for the most part small and poor; almost all articles of common use were imported, and the country had little to give in exchange. All the interest of the public debt went to foreign creditors. As early as 1595 the discontent was very great; and so many emigrated, in order to escape the heavy burdens, that Cardinal Sacchetti said, in 1664, that the population was reduced by one-half. In the year 1740 the president De Brosses found the Roman government the most defective but the mildest in Europe. Becattini, in his panegyric biography of Pius VI., declares that it was the worst

after that of Turkey. There were none of those limitations which in other countries restrained the power of the monarch,—no fundamental laws, no coronation oath, no binding decrees of predecessors, no provincial estates, no powerful corporations. But, in reality, this unlimited absolutism was softened by custom, and by great indulgence towards individuals.

When Consalvi adopted the French institutions, he did not understand that an absolute government is intolerable, and must sink under the weight of its responsibility, unless it recognises the restraint of custom and tradition, and of subordinate but not dependent forces. The unity and uniformity he introduced were destructive. He restored none of the liberties of the towns, and confided the administration to ecclesiastics superficially acquainted with law, and without knowledge of politics or of public economy. In the ecclesiastical States of Germany, the civil and religious departments were separate; and it is as wrong to say that the double position of the head must repeat itself throughout the administration, as to say that a king, because he is the head of the army as well as of the civil government, ought to mix the two spheres throughout the state. It would, in reality, be perfectly possible to separate the political and ecclesiastical authorities.

Leo XII. attempted to satisfy the Zelanti, the adversaries of Consalvi, by restoring the old system. He abolished the provincial councils, revived the Inquisition, and subjected official honesty and public morality to a strict espionage. Leo saw the error of Consalvi, but mistook the remedy; and his government was the most unpopular that had been seen for a century. Where the laity are excluded from the higher offices, and the clergy enjoy the monopoly of them, that moral power which modern bureaucracy derives from the corporate spirit, and the feelings of honour which it inspires, cannot subsist. One class becomes demoralised by its privileged position, the other by its limited prospects and insufficient pay. Leo tried to control them by the *congregazione di vigilanze*, which received and examined all charges against official persons; but it was suppressed by his successor.

The famous Memorandum of the Powers, 31st May 1831, recommended the admission of the laity to all secular offices, the restoration of the provincial councils, and the introduction of elective communal councils with the power of local government, and, finally, a security against the changes incident to an elective sovereignty. The historian Coppi, who

was charged to draw up a plan of reform in reply to these demands, relates that the Pope and the majority of the Cardinals rejected every serious change, and were resolved to uphold the old principles, and to concede nothing to the lay party, "because, if any thing was voluntarily conceded, there would be no right of recalling it afterwards." Two things in particular it was determined not to grant,—elective councils in the towns and provinces, and a lay council of state beside the Sacred College. In a general way, vague reforms were promised; but the promise was not redeemed. Austria would not tolerate any liberal concessions in Italy, which were in contradiction with her own system and her own interests; thus all Italian aspirations for reform were concentrated in the wish to get rid of the foreign yoke, and Austria never succeeded in forming a party amongst the Italians favourable to her power. Yet Gregory XVI. knew that great changes were needed. In 1843 he said: "The civil administration requires a great reform. I was too old when I was elected; I did not expect to live so long, and had not the courage to begin the undertaking. For whoever begins, must accomplish it. I have now only a few years to live; perhaps only a few days. After me they will choose a young Pope, whose mission it will be to perform the act, without which it is impossible to go on."

The Austrian occupation caused the Roman government to be identified with the foreign supremacy, and transferred to it the hatred of the patriots. The disaffection of the subjects of the Pope had deeper motives. Except the clergy, that overshadows all, there are no distinct orders in the society of the Roman State; no country nobility, no wealthy class of peasant proprietors; nothing but the population of the towns, and a degenerate class of patricians. These were generally hostile to the ecclesiastical system. The offices are so distributed, that the clergy govern, and the laity are their instruments. In the principal departments, no amount of services or ability could raise a layman above a certain level, beyond which younger and less competent ecclesiastics were promoted over his head. This subordination, which led to a regular dependence of the lay officials on the prelates, drove the best men away from the service of the state, and disposed the rest to long for a government which should throw open to them the higher prizes of their career. Even the country people, who were never tainted with the ideas of the secret societies, were not always well affected.

It is more difficult for a priest than for a layman to put aside his private views and feelings in the administration of

justice. He is the servant and herald of grace, of forgiveness, of indulgence, and easily forgets that in human concerns the law is inexorable, that favour to one is often injury to many or to all, and that he has no right to place his own will above the law. He is still more disqualified for the direction of the police, which, in an absolute state and in troubled times, uses its unlimited power without reference to Christian ideas, leaves unpunished acts which are grievous sins, and punishes others which in a religious point of view are innocent. It is hard for the people to distinguish clearly the priestly character from the action of its bearer in the administration of police. The same indifference to the strict letter of the law, the same confusion between breaches of divine and of human ordinances, led to a practice of arbitrary imprisonment, which contrasts painfully with the natural gentleness of a priestly government. Hundreds of persons were cast into prison without a trial or even an examination, only on suspicion, and kept there more than a year for greater security.

The immunities of the clergy were as unpopular as their power. The laws and decrees of the Pope as a temporal sovereign were not held to be binding on them unless it was expressly said, or was clear from the context, that they were given also in his character of Head of the Church. Ecclesiastics were tried before their own tribunals, and had the right to be more lightly punished than laymen for the same delinquency. Those events in the life of Achilli, which came out at his trial, had not only brought down on him no severe punishment, but did not stand in the way of his promotion. With all these privileges, the bulk of the Roman clergy had little to do; little was expected of them, and their instruction was extremely deficient.

At the end of the pontificate of Gregory XVI. the demand for reforms was loud and universal, and men began to perceive that the defects of the civil government were undermining the religious attachment of the people. The Conclave which raised Pius IX. to the papal throne was the shortest that had occurred for near 300 years. The necessity of choosing a Pontiff disposed to understand and to satisfy the pressing requirements of the time, made it important to hasten matters, in order to escape the interference of Austria. It was expected that Cardinal Gizzi or Cardinal Mastai would be elected. The latter had been pointed out by Gregory XVI. as his fittest successor, and he made Gizzi secretary of state. The first measure of the new reign, the amnesty, which, as Metternich said, threw open the doors of the house to the

professional robbers, was taken not so much as an act of policy, as because the Pope was resolved to undo an accumulation of injustice. The reforms which followed soon made Pius the most popular of Italian princes; and all Catholics rejoiced that the reconciliation of the Papacy with modern freedom was at length accomplished, and that the shadow which had fallen on the priesthood throughout the world was removed with the abuses in the Roman government. The Constitution was, perhaps, an inevitable though a fatal necessity. "The Holy Father must fall," said his minister; "but at least he will fall with honour." The preliminary conditions of constitutional life were wanting—habits of self-government in the towns and provinces, security from the vexations of the police, separation of spiritual and temporal jurisdiction. It could not be but that the existence of an elective chamber must give to the lay element a preponderance in the state, whilst in the administration the contrary position was maintained. There could be no peaceful solution of this contradiction; and it is strange that the Cardinals, who were unanimously in favour of the statute, should not have seen that it would lead to the destruction of the privileges of the clergy. But in the allocution of 20th April 1849, the Pope declared that he had never intended to alter the character of his government; so that he must have thought the old system of administration by ecclesiastics compatible with the working of the new Constitution. At his return from exile, all his advisers were in favour of abrogating all the concessions of the first years of his reign. Balbo and Rosmini visited him at Gaeta, to plead for the Constitution; but they obtained nothing. Pius IX. was persuaded that every concession would be a weapon in the hands of the Radicals. A lay *consulta* gave to the laity a share in the supreme government; but the chief offices and the last decision remained, as before, in the hands of the prelates. Municipal reforms were promised. In general the old defects continued, and the old discontent was not conciliated.

It is manifest that Constitutionalism, as it is ordinarily understood, is not a system which can be applied to the States of the Church. It could not be tolerated that a war-like faction, by refusing supplies, should compel the Pope to go to war with a Christian nation, as they sought to compel him to declare war against Austria in 1848. His sovereignty must be real, not merely nominal. It makes no difference whether he is in the power of a foreign state or of a parliamentary majority. But real sovereignty is compatible with a participation of the people in legislation, the autonomy of

corporations, a moderate freedom of the press, and the separation of religion and police.

Recent events would induce one to suppose that the enormous power of the press and of public opinion, which it forms and reflects, is not understood in Rome. In 1856 the Inquisitor at Ancona issued an edict, threatening with the heaviest censures all who should omit to denounce the religious or ecclesiastical faults of their neighbours, relatives, or superiors; and in defiance of the general indignation, and of the despondency of those who, for the sake of religion, desired reforms in the States of the Church, the *Civiltà Cattolica* declared that the Inquisitor had done his duty. Such cases as this, and those of Achilli and Mortara, weighed more heavily in the scale in which the Roman State is weighed than a lost battle. Without discussing the cases themselves, it is clear what their influence has been on public opinion, with which it is more important at the present day to treat than with the governments which depend on it. This branch of diplomacy has been unfortunately neglected, and hence the Roman government cannot rely on lay support.

After describing the evils and disorders of the State, which the Pope so deeply felt that he put his own existence in peril, and inflamed half of Europe with the spirit of radical change, in the attempt to remove them, Dr. Döllinger contrasts, with the gloomy picture of decay and failure, the character of the Pontiff who attempted the great work of reform.

“Nevertheless, the administration of Pius IX. is wise, benevolent, indulgent, thrifty, attentive to useful institutions and improvements. All that proceeds from Pius IX. personally is worthy of a Head of the Church—elevated, liberal in the best sense of the term. No sovereign spends less on his court and his own private wants. If all thought and acted as he does, his would be a model state. Both the French and the English envoys affirm that the financial administration had improved, that the value of the land was increasing, agriculture flourishing, and that many symptoms of progress might be observed. Whatever can be expected of a monarch full of affection for his people, and seeking his sole recreation in works of beneficence, Pius richly performs. *Pertransiit benefaciendo*,—words used of one far greater,—are simply the truth applied to him. In him we can clearly perceive how the Papacy, even as a temporal state, might, so far as the character of the prince is concerned, through judicious elections, be the most admirable of human institutions. A man in the prime of life, after an irreproachable youth and a conscientious discharge of episcopal duties, is elevated to the highest dignity and to sovereign power. He knows nothing of expensive amusements; he has no other passion but that of doing good, no other am-

bition but to be beloved by his subjects. His day is divided between prayer and the labours of government; his relaxation is a walk in the garden, a visit to a church, a prison, or a charitable institution. Free from personal desires and from terrestrial bonds, he has no relatives, no favourites to provide for. For him the rights and powers of his office exist only for the sake of its duties. . . . Grievously outraged, injured, rewarded with ingratitude, he has never harboured a thought of revenge, never committed an act of severity, but ever forgiven and ever pardoned. The cup of sweetness and of bitterness, the cup of human favour and of human aversion, he has not only tasted, but emptied to the dregs; he heard them cry 'Hosanna!' and soon after 'Crucifige!' The man of his confidence, the first intellectual power of his nation, fell beneath the murderer's knife; the bullet of an insurgent struck down the friend by his side. And yet no feeling of hatred, no breath of anger could ever obscure, even for a moment, the spotless mirror of his soul. Untouched by human folly, unmoved by human malice, he proceeds with a firm and regular step on his way, like the stars of heaven.

Such I have seen the action of this Pope in Rome, such it has been described to me by all, whether near him or afar; and if he now seems to be appointed to pass through all the painful and discouraging experience which can befall a monarch, and to continue to the end the course of a prolonged martyrdom, he resembles in this, as in so many other things, the Sixteenth Louis; or rather, to go up higher, he knows that the disciple is not above the Master, and that the pastor of a church, whose Lord and Founder died upon the cross, cannot wonder and cannot refuse that the cross should be laid also upon him." (pp. 624-627.)

It is a common opinion, that the Pope, as a sovereign, is bound by the canon law to the forms and ideas of the middle ages; and that in consequence of the progress of society, of the difference between the thirteenth century and the nineteenth, there is an irreconcilable discord between the Papacy and the necessities of civil government. All Catholics are bound to oppose this opinion. Only that which is of Divine institution is unchangeable through all time. But the sovereignty of the Popes is extremely elastic, and has already gone through many forms. No contrast can be stronger than between the use which the Popes made of their power in the thirteenth or the fifteenth century, and the system of Consalvi. There is no reason, therefore, to doubt, that it will now, after a violent interruption, assume the form best adapted to the character of the age and the requirements of the Italian people. There is nothing chimerical in the vision of a new order of things, in which the election shall fall on men in the prime of their years and

their strength; in which the people shall be reconciled to their government by free institutions and a share in the conduct of their own concerns, and the upper classes satisfied by the opening of a suitable career in public affairs. Justice publicly and speedily administered would obtain the confidence of the people; the public service would be sustained by an honourable *esprit de corps*; the chasm between laity and priesthood would be closed by equality in rights and duties; the police would not rely on the help of religion, and religion would no longer drag itself along on the crutches of the police. The integrity of the Papal States would be under the joint guardianship of the Powers, who have guaranteed even the dominions of the Sultan; and the Pope would have no enemies to fear, and his subjects would be delivered from the burden of military service and of a military budget.

Religious liberty is not, as the enemies of the Holy See declare, and some even of its friends believe, an insurmountable difficulty. Events often cut the knots which appear insoluble to theory. Attempts at proselytising have not hitherto succeeded among the subjects of the Pope; but if it had been otherwise, would it have been possible for the Inquisition to proceed against a Protestant? The agitation that must have ensued would be a welcome opportunity to put an end to what remains of the temporal power. It is true that the advance of Protestantism in Italy would raise up a barrier between the Pope and his subjects; but no such danger is to be apprehended. At the time when the doctrines of the Reformation exercised an almost magical power over mankind, they never took root in Italy beyond a few men of letters; and now that their power of attraction and expansion has long been exhausted, neither Sardinian policy nor English gold will succeed in seducing the Italians to them.

The present position of helpless and humiliating dependence will not long endure. The determination of the Piedmontese government to annex Rome is not more certain than the determination of the Emperor Napoleon to abrogate the temporal power. Pius IX. would enjoy greater security in Turkey than in the hands of a State which combines the tyranny of the Convention, the impudent sophistry of a government of advocates, and the ruthless brutality of military despotism. Rather than trust to Piedmont, may Pius IX. remember the example of his greatest predecessors, who, relying on the spiritual might of the Papacy, sought beyond the Alps the freedom which Italy denied to them.

The Papacy has beheld the rise and the destruction of many thrones, and will assuredly outlive the kingdom of Italy, and other monarchies besides. It can afford to wait; *patiens quia aternus*. The Romans need the Pope more than the Pope needs Rome. Above the Catacombs, among the Basilicas, beside the Vatican, there is no place for a tribune or for a king. We shall see what was seen in the fourteenth century: envoys will come from Rome to entreat the Pope to return to his faithful city.

Whilst things continue as they are, the emperor can, by threatening to withdraw his troops, compel the Pope to consent to any thing not actually sinful. Such a situation is alarming in the highest degree for other countries. But for the absolute confidence that all men have in the fidelity and conscientiousness of the present Pope, and for the providential circumstance that there is no ecclesiastical complication which the French government could use for its own ends, it would not be tolerated by the rest of the Catholic world. Sooner or later these conditions of security will disappear, and the interest of the Church demands that before that happens, the peril should be averted, even by a catastrophe.

The hostility of the Italians themselves to the Holy See is the tragic symptom of the present malady. In other ages when it was assailed, the Italians were on its side, or at least were neutral. Now they require the destruction of the temporal power, either as a necessary sacrifice for the unity and greatness of their country, or as a just consequence of incurable defects. The time will come, however, when they will be reconciled with the Papacy, and with its presence as a power among them. It was the dependence of the Pope on the Austrian arms, and his identification in popular opinion with the cause of the detested foreigner, that obscured his lofty position as the moral bulwark and protector of the nation. For 1500 years the Holy See was the pivot of Italian history, and the source of the Italian influence in Europe. The nation and the See shared the same fortunes, and grew powerful or feeble together. It was not until the vices of Alexander VI. and his predecessors had destroyed the reverence which was the protection of Italy, that she became the prey of the invaders. None of the great Italian historians has failed to see that they would ruin themselves in raising their hands against Rome. The old prophecy of the Papa Angelico, of an Angel Pope, who was to rise up to put an end to discord and disorder, and to restore piety and peace and happiness in Italy, was but the significant token

of the popular belief that the Papacy and the nation were bound up together, and that one was the guardian of the other. That belief slumbers, now that the idea of unity prevails, whilst the Italians are attempting to put the roof on a building without walls and without foundations; but it will revive again, when centralisation is compelled to yield to federalism, and the road to the practicable has been found in the search after impossibilities.

The tyrannical character of the Piedmontese government, its contempt for the sanctity of public law, the principles on which it treats the clergy at home, and the manner in which it has trampled on the rights of the Pope and the interests of religion, the perfidy and despotism it exhibits, render it impossible that any securities it may offer to the Pope can possess a real value. Moreover, in the unsettled state of the kingdom, the uncertain succession of parties, and the fluctuation of power, whatever guarantee is proposed by the ministry, there is nobody to guarantee the guarantor. It is a system without liberty and without stability; and the Pope can never be reconciled to it, or become a dweller in the new Italian kingdom.

If he must choose between the position of a subject and of an exile, he is at home in the whole Catholic world, and wherever he goes he will be surrounded by children who will greet him as their father. It may become an inevitable, but it must always be a heroic resolution. The court and the various congregations for the administration of the affairs of the Church are too numerous to be easily moved. In former times the machinery was more simple, and the whole body of the pontifical government could be lodged in a single French monastery. The absence of the Pope from Rome will involve great difficulties and annoyance; but it is a lesser evil than a surrender of principle, which cannot be recalled.

To remove the Holy See to France would, under present circumstances, be an open challenge to a schism, and would afford to all who wish to curtail the papal rights, or to interrupt the communication between the Pope and the several Churches, the most welcome pretexts, and it would put arms in the hands of governments that wish to impede the action of his authority within their states.

The conclusion of the book is as follows :

" If the Court of Rome should reside for a time in Germany, the Roman prelates will doubtless be agreeably surprised to discover that our people is able to remain Catholic and religious without the leading-strings of a police, and that its religious sentiments are a

better protection to the Church than the episcopal *carceri*, which, thank God, do not exist. They will learn that the Church in Germany is able to maintain herself without the Holy Office ; that our Bishops, although, or because, they use no physical compulsion, are revered like princes by the people, that they are received with triumphal arches, that their arrival in a place is a festival for the inhabitants. They will see how the Church with us rests on the broad, strong, and healthy basis of a well-organised system of pastoral administration and of popular religious instruction. They will perceive that we Catholics have maintained for years the struggle for the deliverance of the Church from the bonds of bureaucracy straightforwardly and without reservation ; that we cannot entertain the idea of denying to the Italians what we have claimed for ourselves ; and that therefore we are far from thinking that it is any where an advantage to fortify the Church with the authority of the police and with the power of the secular arm. Throughout Germany we have been taught by experience the truth of Fénelon's saying, that the spiritual power must be carefully kept separate from the civil, because their union is pernicious. They will find further, that the whole of the German clergy is prepared to bless the day when it shall learn that the free sovereignty of the Pope is assured, without sentence of death being still pronounced by ecclesiastics, without priests continuing to discharge the functions of treasury-clerks or police-directors, or to conduct the business of the lottery. And, finally, they will convince themselves that all the Catholics of Germany will stand up as one man for the independence of the Holy See, and the legitimate rights of the Pope ; but that they are no admirers of a form of government of very recent date, which is, in fact, nothing else than the product of the mechanical polity of Napoleon combined with a clerical administration. And this information will bear good fruit when the hour shall strike for the return, and restitution shall be made. . . .

Meanwhile Pius IX. and the men of his council will 'think upon the days of old, and have in their minds the eternal years.' They will read the future in the earlier history of the Papacy, which has already seen many an exile and many a restoration. The example of the resolute, courageous Popes of the middle ages will light the way. It is no question now of suffering martyrdom, of clinging to the tombs of the Apostles, or of descending into the catacombs ; but of quitting the land of bondage, in order to exclaim on a free soil, 'Our bonds are broken, and we are free !' For the rest God will provide, and the unceasing gifts and sympathies of the Catholic world. And the parties in Italy, when they have torn and exhausted the land which has become a battle-field ; when the sobered and saddened people, tired of the rule of lawyers and of soldiers, has understood the worth of a moral and spiritual authority, then will be the time to think of returning to the Eternal City. In the interval, the things will have disappeared for whose preservation such pains are taken ; and then there will be better reason than

Consalvi had, in the preface to the *motu proprio* of 6th July 1816, to say: 'Divine Providence, which so conducts human affairs that out of the greatest calamity innumerable benefits proceed, seems to have intended that the interruption of the papal government should prepare the way for a more perfect form of it.' "

We have written at a length for which we must apologise to our readers; and yet this is but a meagre sketch of the contents of a book which deals with a very large proportion of the subjects that occupy the thoughts and move the feelings of religious men. We will attempt to sum up in a few words the leading ideas of the author. Addressing a mixed audience, he undertakes to controvert two different interpretations of the events which are being fulfilled in Rome. To the Protestants, who triumph in the expected downfall of the Papacy, he shows the consequence of being without it. To the Catholics, who see in the Roman question a great peril to the Church, he explains how the possession of the temporal sovereignty had become a greater misfortune than its loss for a time would be. From the opposite aspects of the religious camps of our age he endeavours to awaken the misgivings of one party, and to strengthen the confidence of the other. There is an inconsistency between the Protestant system and the progress of modern learning: there is none between the authority of the Holy See and the progress of modern society. The events which are tending to deprive the Pope of his territory are not to be therefore deplored, if we consider the preceding causes, because they made this catastrophe inevitable: still less if, looking to the future, we consider the state of Protestantism, because they remove an obstacle to union which is humanly almost insurmountable. In a former work Döllinger exhibited the moral and intellectual exhaustion of Paganism, as the prelude to Christianity. In like manner he now confronts the dissolution and spiritual decay of Protestantism with the Papacy. But in order to complete the contrast, and give force to the vindication, it was requisite that the true function and character of the Holy See should not be concealed from the unpractised vision of strangers, by the mask of that system of government which has grown up around it in modern times. The importance of this violent disruption of the two authorities consists in the state of religion throughout the world. Its cause lies in the deficiencies of the temporal power; its end, in the mission of the spiritual.

The interruption of the temporal sovereignty is the only way we can discern in which these deficiencies can be remedied, and these ends obtained. But this interruption

cannot be prolonged. In an age in which the State throughout the Continent is absolute, and tolerates no immunities; when corporations have therefore less freedom than individuals, and the disposition to restrict their action increases in proportion to their power, the Pope cannot be independent as a subject. He must therefore be a sovereign, the free ruler of an actual territory, protected by international law and a European guarantee. The restoration consequently is necessary, though not as an immediate consequence of the revolution. In this revolutionary age the protection of the Catholic powers is required against outward attack. They must also be our security that no disaffection is provoked within; that there shall be no recurrence of the dilemma between the right of insurrection against an arbitrary government and the duty of obedience to the Pope; and that civil society shall not again be convulsed, nor the pillars of law and order throughout Europe shaken, by a revolution against the Church, of which, in the present instance, the conservative powers share the blame, and have already felt the consequences.

In the earnest and impressive language of the conclusion, in which Döllinger conveys the warnings which all Transalpine Catholicism owes to its Head as an Italian sovereign, it seems to us that something more definite is intended than the expression of the wish, which almost every Catholic feels, to receive the Pope in his own country. The anxiety for his freedom which would be felt if he took refuge in France, would be almost equally justified by his presence in Austria. A residence in an exclusively Catholic country, such as Spain, would be contrary to the whole spirit of this book, and to the moral which it inculcates, that the great significance of the crisis is in the state of German Protestantism. If the position of the Catholics in Germany would supply useful lessons and examples to the Roman court, it is also from the vicinity of the Protestant world that the full benefit can best be drawn from its trials, and that the crimes of the Italians, which have begun as calamities, may be turned to the advantage of the Church. But against such counsels there is a powerful influence at work. Napoleon has declared his determination to sweep away the temporal power. The continuance of the occupation of Rome, and his express prohibition to the Piedmontese government to proceed with the annexation during the life of the present Pope, signify that he calculates on greater advantages in a Conclave than from the patient resolution of Pius IX. This policy is supported by the events in Italy in a formidable manner. The

more the Piedmontese appear as enemies and persecutors, the more the emperor will appear as the only saviour; and the dread of a prolonged exile in any Catholic country, and of dependence for subsistence on the contributions of the faithful, must exhibit in a fascinating light the enjoyment of the splendid hospitality and powerful protection of France. On these hopes and fears, and on the difficulties which are pressing on the Cardinals from the loss of their revenues, the emperor speculates, and persuades himself that he will be master of the next election. On the immovable constancy of her Supreme Pontiff the Catholic Church unconditionally relies; and we are justified in believing that, in an almost unparalleled emergency, he will not tremble before a resolution of which no Pope has given an example since the consolidation of the temporal power.

THE EDUCATION COMMISSION.*

IF in any condition of society the Catholic could remain indifferent to questions directly affecting the welfare of the labouring classes, in Great Britain at least self-interest unites with religion to render such indifference impossible. Here these questions are our own, for we are of the labouring classes. The aristocratic element—proportionately considerable, and even predominant before emancipation—wastes away. Death, defection, extravagance, and exclusiveness create a vacuum which, with other religious bodies, new families rush in to supply. To us neither arts nor arms, neither army, navy, law, literature, nor even commerce, bring notable accessions of rank or wealth. Deprived of a common culture, we cannot compete successfully in the public arena; and thus, exhausted by the natural processes of decay, and unsupported by invigorating influences, we tend towards extinction rather than rejuvenescence. The conquests of the Faith by conversion resist the tendency, but do not stay it. The symptoms may be obscured, but the cause is not removed; and a fitful and irregular modification applies no permanent relief to a chronic malady. Meantime, while the higher orders suffer diminution, the increase of the labour-

* Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the State of Popular Education in England. Six vols. 8vo. 1861.

ing class has been prodigious. In 1851 the Registrar-General computed the number of Irish-born residents among us at 1,000,000; and the natural increase of a prolific race, recruited by continuous immigration, cannot fail in the decade just closed to have produced a very large addition. Thus the Celtic element in the English Catholic body preponderates over the Saxon, and characterises the whole.

Upon the condition of the Irish immigrants it is needless to dwell at length. Suffice it to say, that their moral and intellectual qualities formed a marked contrast to their social position. They were at once the best and the lowest of the people. Driven by want from home and agricultural pursuits, and herded in the meanest quarters of all large towns, whatever of labour's tasks was hardest and worst paid, that they undertook to perform. Thus maintaining a daily contest with material ills, and lost to the saving influence of public opinion, they could not preserve unsullied the virtues of the Irish character. Their children, above all, were exposed to a wretched fate. Reared in the impure atmosphere of murky cities, and too often wanting the counsels and aids of religion, they possessed neither the hardy constitution nor the lively faith of their fathers. Feeble and emaciated in frame, seduced by vice and crime, their existence seemed as hopeless as it was miserable.

Among social questions, then, all of which should interest Catholics deeply, none presses more importunately for consideration than the method of dealing with the young. The old question of education remains ever new and attractive to each succeeding generation. But when the professors of a particular creed belong in overwhelming numbers to the labouring classes, and when plain and undeniable considerations manifest that the children of labourers are growing to be different from their fathers in character and habits, then surely the condition and training of youth rise into unusual and paramount importance. It is because we are numerous and poor that English Catholics, apart from the fortuitous incentives of personal ambition and the blinding confusion of foreign intricacies, can never seriously adopt principles which overlook the cause and interests of the many, and while pampering the few—*fruges consumere natos*—condemn the working swarm to ignorance and degradation. Religion and policy alike forbid it.

It has been said, and with an appearance of truth, that Catholics are peculiarly sensitive and thin-skinned. Encompassed by foes who seem bent on detraction, we defend ourselves by for ever blowing the trumpet of self-laudation.

Our shouts of praise, however, seldom reach the enemy, and still more rarely move him, while they deafen and enervate ourselves. Two lies will not make truth, any more than two wrongs make right. A bold candour, perhaps, would show more wisdom and attain greater success. It might deliver us from some tyranny both without and within.

Quoi ! je souffrirai, moi, qu'un cagot de critique
Vienne usurper céans un pouvoir tyrannique ?

It is not invariably prudent to contradict the statements of well-informed opponents, or to yield to the acrimony of petulant friends. Moderate pretensions and a firm attitude win more respect than inflated estimates or cowardly concession.

The Report of the Royal Commission on Popular Education deserves attentive notice. It affords glimpses of the national estimate of Catholics ; it treats of subjects of momentous interest ; and it has revolutionised the system of Government grants to primary schools. We propose to make our readers acquainted with its bearing upon these subjects.

The value and the neglect of blue-books are proverbial. The strenuous idleness of the age is gratified by the laborious collection of information, while its fear of change and love of compromise shrink from acting upon the materials collected. Who would rest content without a searching inquiry into popular education, and a thousand other questions, all at the public expense ? and how many will investigate the results ?

The Commission to inquire into the present state of popular education in England, and to consider and report what measures, if any, are required for the extension of sound and cheap elementary instruction to all classes of the people, was issued by royal authority upon the 30th of June 1858 to the Duke of Newcastle, Sir John Coleridge, the Rev. W. C. Lake, the Rev. W. Rogers, Mr. Goldwin Smith, Mr. Nassau Senior, and Mr. Miall,—with power to call before them such persons as they should judge necessary ; to conduct the inquiry by all lawful ways and means, within all parts of England ; to administer oaths ; to demand the production of all records, books, and papers ; and to propose fitting regulations. They were to report within two years ; and all her Majesty's loving subjects whatsoever were commanded to be assistant in the execution of the Commission. Thus appointed, the Commissioners adopted a scientific method of inquiry. Setting aside whatever was already known, and whatever principles might have been taken as established,

they resolved to collect the facts afresh, as materials for a new and independent induction. Such an investigation, if extended over a large area, would have been encumbered by such an immense mass of bewildering details as to become utterly unmanageable. The Commissioners, therefore, determined to select ten circumscribed localities as specimens of the kingdom, and to collect all the educational phenomena displayed in them by means of ten assistants. The Assistant-Commissioners were required to dismiss from their minds all previous conclusions, and to confine themselves to the collection of facts touching the statistics, condition, methods, and results of education, without any controversial bias, ecclesiastical, political, or economical. Having thus obtained their premisses, the Commissioners reserved to themselves the task of generalising conclusions from them. Whether education is yet capable of this scientific treatment may be seriously questioned. The method was, at least, more philosophical than the attempts at deduction so much in favour with charlatans, who manufacture first principles at pleasure, and suppress their major premiss as often as convenience requires.

The specimen districts comprised two agricultural, two manufacturing, two mining, two maritime, and two metropolitan groups of population. Two Protestant clergymen, the Rev. T. Hedley and the Rev. J. Fraser, took certain agricultural parishes in Lincolnshire and adjoining counties on the east, and in Hereford and Dorset on the west. Bradford and Rochdale, assigned to Mr. Winder, and Dudley and the Potteries, examined by Mr. Coode, represented manufacturing England. Mr. Foster took the mining parts of Durham, and Mr. Jenkins Neath and Merthyr in Wales. For seaports, Bristol and Devonport were inspected by Mr. Cumin, and Hull, Yarmouth, and Ipswich by Mr. Hare. In the metropolis the examination extended over the unions of St. Pancras, St. George's-in-the-East, and Chelsea, by Mr. Wilkinson; and East London, St. George's Southwark, Newington, Wandsworth, St. Olave's Southwark, and St. Saviour's Southwark, by Dr. Hodgson. In addition to the employment of inspectors within the districts above numerated, the Commissioners freely circulated a paper of apposite questions among persons of all shades of opinion practically conversant with popular education, and they took the *vivâ voce* evidence of several witnesses officially connected with the Committee of Council on Education and the Charity Commission. The educational societies of all denominations furnished the Commission with

statistical returns. Besides the various inquiries pursued in England, two Assistant-Commissioners, the Rev. M. Pattison and Mr. Matthew Arnold, were employed to report upon the system and state of education in Germany, France, Switzerland, and Holland.

The Commissioners report that "information was afforded to their assistants upon all the subjects of their inquiry by almost every one to whom they applied for that purpose, though they had no compulsory powers. The only exception of importance was in the case of the Roman Catholic schools, admission to which was uniformly refused." And they print their correspondence with the Catholic Poor-School Committee, which is curious and worth recording. Upon September 27, 1858, Mr. Stephen, having learnt from Mr. Allies that "if the Assistant-Commissioners were Protestants they would find a difficulty in obtaining admission into Roman Catholic schools," addressed an explanatory letter to the Hon. Charles Langdale, the universally-respected chairman of the Poor-School Committee, pointing out that "the only object which the Commissioners have in view is to obtain complete and accurate information upon the subject-matter of their inquiry. In order that they may be able to ascertain the number of persons for whom no education at all is provided, and to compare the working and results of different systems of education, it is absolutely necessary that the examination which they have undertaken should be local, and not denominational; and it is therefore manifestly necessary that many of the schools visited should be visited by persons who differ from their conductors in religious creed. The instructions of the Assistant-Commissioners enjoin upon them in the strongest way abstinence from any expression of controversial feeling." Mr. Langdale replied, on October 11, 1858, that the Catholic Poor-School Committee had "repeatedly stated why they would not admit any but Catholic inspectors to hold intercourse with their schools, and can see no reason for departing from their principles, then so clearly laid down as the only ones upon which Catholic schools could consent to avail themselves of the parliamentary grant for education. In the present inquiry, no Catholic representation has been admitted; and under the circumstances of such exclusion the Catholic Poor-School Committee must decline being a party to the proposed objects of the correspondence." Upon January 11, 1859, Mr. Langdale wrote again on behalf of the Poor-School Committee, "to state further that this refusal of coöperation extended to the cir-

culatation of the statistical inquiries, an answer to which, had they considered their interests to be fairly represented, they would most readily have endeavoured to procure." But between January and May—the dates are significant—a change had occurred. On the 9th of the latter month Mr. Langdale wrote for the third time, and in an altered tone. The matter had again been taken into consideration, and "the Committee, whilst adhering to the principle of admitting none but Catholic inspectors to inquire into their schools," now offer to "collect such information as may be afforded by replies to the circulars," and, upon the appointment of one or more Catholic Assistant-Commissioners, to give "admission to our schools, for the purpose of inquiry into the character of our secular instruction." They offer, also, to name qualified witnesses for examination, and to "give answers to any other questions which the Royal Commissioners might deem it expedient to ask." But the opportunity had already passed away, and the Committee was informed that the Assistant-Commissioners had concluded their inquiry, and that there was no present intention of examining witnesses. The offer of statistical information was accepted with thanks, and at this point the correspondence closes.

Thus excluded from Catholic schools, the Commissioners (like other men) had three courses open to them. They might have resolved to conduct the inquiry personally, and to have exercised the compulsory powers possessed by themselves, though not by their deputies. This course would have been highly inconvenient to an unpaid Commission, as well as foreign to modern practice, and generally offensive. Or they might have moved the Crown to issue a new Commission, overcoming the difficulty either by the conciliatory plan of including a Catholic Commissioner, or by the ruder process of extending power to assistants. Arbitrary and forcible entry into schools was not to be thought of, and it did not appear that conciliation was possible without an abandonment of the basis of impartial investigation. There remained the third course: to proceed with the inquiry independently of Catholic schools, which, as being of small moment in the Commissioners' eyes, might be omitted without injury to general conclusions; just as a geometrician suppresses the microscopic breadth of his lines without sacrificing the accuracy of his problems. Moreover, whatever in the conduct of Catholic schools was particularly deserving of remark, might readily be learnt in other countries, where the Poor-School Committee's insular principle had not penetrated. The loss,

if any, would fall on the English Catholics who had created the obstacle, and the Commissioners' Report would not on that account be less acceptable to the Protestant majority. If Catholics were misrepresented during the inquiry, or neglected in subsequent legislation, the responsibility would not rest with the Commissioners, whose assistants were as ready to visit Catholic schools in England as in France, and who obtained statistics from the Catholic Poor-School Committee, and evidence in writing, or *vivâ voce*, from Mr. Langdale, Mr. Allies, and Mr. T. W. Marshall.

The Commissioners' Report fills an octavo volume of 682 pages. Two volumes, of nearly equal bulk, contain the separate reports of the ten Assistant-Commissioners employed in England. The fourth volume, which is shorter, gives the reports upon education in France, Holland, Switzerland, and Germany, together with special reports upon educational charities, upon schools in Liverpool, and on training colleges. Then follow the answers to the Commissioners' circular of questions; and the series ends with a sixth volume, giving the minutes of evidence taken before them. It is to the notices, direct or incidental, of Catholic schools scattered throughout this voluminous Report that we shall confine our attention in the present article.

The statistics, if accurate, would have possessed high value; but as they were collected by religious societies through local agents, variously moved either by exaggeration or contempt, they can be regarded only as an approximation to the facts. Perhaps careless omissions on one side may be balanced by excessive estimates on the other; and it is remarkable that the Commissioners themselves possessed, or incidentally acquired, information about Catholic schools in two counties,—Derby and Hereford,—returned to them by the Poor-School Committee as containing no Catholic schools at all. They give, however, the nearest approach to accuracy which we are likely to obtain for many years to come, and, as fixing even roughly the numbers and distribution of Catholic school-children in a particular year, deserve to be recorded for future reference and comparison.

PUBLIC WEEK-DAY SCHOOLS AND SCHOLARS IN COUNTIES.

COUNTY.	Returned to Commissioners, 1858.				Inspected by Privy Council, 1859.			
	Day-Schools.		Night-Schools.		Day-Schools.		Night-Schools.	
	Rooms.	Children.	Rooms.	Children.	Rooms.	Children.	Rooms.	Children.
Bedford . . .	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Berks . . .	5	221	0	0	1	—	0	0
Bucks . . .	1	60	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cambridge . .	2	69	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cheshire . . .	13	1,427	6	1,572	16	1,616	8	1,254
Cornwall . . .	5	261	1	54	0	0	0	0
Cumberland . .	5	620	1	48	4	352	0	0
Derby . . .	0	0	0	0	4	404	0	0
Devon . . .	5	352	0	0	3	232	0	0
Dorset . . .	2	119	0	0	0	0	0	0
Durham . . .	17	2,322	7	202	8	918	0	0
Essex . . .	8	296	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gloucester . .	15	1,511	3	106	5	509	0	0
Hampshire . .	18	850	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hereford . . .	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hertford . . .	2	64	0	0	0	0	0	0
Huntingdon . .	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kent . . .	18	1,826	0	0	3	437	0	0
Lancaster . . .	200	27,585	48	4,787	142	16,623	31	3,188
Leicester . . .	3	208	1	40	1	125	0	0
Lincoln . . .	2	118	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middlesex . . .	117	15,574	5	266	54	6,948	2	—
Monmouth . . .	4	460	0	0	0	0	0	0
Norfolk . . .	7	322	1	15	0	0	0	0
Northampton .	1	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
Northumberland	15	3,016	4	373	12	1,591	0	0
Nottingham . .	4	772	0	0	6	413	3	173
Oxford . . .	5	221	0	0	2	87	0	0
Rutland . . .	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Salop . . .	3	134	0	0	2	133	0	0
Somerset . . .	11	532	0	0	2	112	0	0
Stafford . . .	42	4,237	5	143	18	1,674	0	0
Suffolk . . .	1	25	0	0	0	0	0	0
Surrey . . .	34	3,512	0	0	13	1,125	0	0
Sussex . . .	7	574	0	0	4	269	0	0
Warwick . . .	32	3,287	8	642	17	1,437	0	0
Westmoreland .	1	58	1	22	0	0	0	0
Wilts . . .	3	216	0	0	0	0	0	0
Worcester . . .	9	511	1	22	1	90	1	—
York . . .	60	6,900	0	0	27	3,087	0	0
Isle of Man . .	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Denbigh . . .	1	77	0	0	0	0	0	0
Flint . . .	6	425	1	14	6	335	0	0
Glamorgan . . .	6	989	2	104	0	0	0	0
Other Welsh Counties . . .	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0

We have been at the pains to show not only the number and distribution of Catholic schools and scholars as recorded by the latest public authority, but in each county we have contrasted the whole number both of day-schools and night-schools with the number receiving Government aid, because at the time when the plan of administering the parliamentary grant for education is about to undergo fundamental changes, it becomes of interest to examine how far the Minutes of 1846, as devised by Sir J. K. Shuttleworth, have succeeded in pervading the public-school system of the kingdom. Out of 690 school-rooms, with an attendance of 79,771, inspection seems to have reached 38,517 scholars, in 351 schools, leaving unassisted the education of one half of the whole number of children in Catholic day-schools. Nearly the same proportion is observed in night-schools, of which 44, with 4615 scholars, obtain grants out of a total of 8413 attending 96 schools. In deference to ecclesiastical authority, we re-arrange the figures under the Catholic dioceses.

DIOCESE.*	Returned to Commissioners, 1858				Inspected by Privy Council, 1859.			
	Day-Schools.		Night-Schools.		Day-Schools.		Night-Schools.	
	Rooms.	Children.	Rooms.	Children.	Rooms.	Children.	Rooms.	Children.
Westminster	127	15,334	5	266	54	6,948	0	0
Beverley .	60	6,900	0	0	27	3,087	0	0
Birmingham	88	8,256	14	807	38	3,288	0	0
Clifton . .	29	2,259	3	106	7	621	0	0
Hexham .	38	6,016	13	645	24	2,861	0	0
Liverpool & Salford . }	200	27,585	48	4,787	142	16,623	31	3,188
Newport . .	10	1,449	3	107	0	0	0	0
Northampton	12	496	1	15	0	0	0	0
Nottingham.	9	1,098	1	40	11	942	3	173
Plymouth .	12	732	1	54	3	232	0	0
Shrewsbury	23	2,063	7	1,586	24	2,084	8	1,254
Southwark .	82	6,983	0	0	21	1,831	0	0
	690	79,771	96	8,413	351	38,517	44	4,615

If the scholars in Catholic schools bear the same proportion to the whole Catholic population as the attendance in public week-day schools bears to the population of England, and if all the children in Catholic schools are Catholics, we

* There are 53 additional Catholic schools, but the returns presented to the Commissioners do not specify the counties to which they belong. The attendance was stated to be 6095 children.

shall get the following results : the Catholic inhabitants of England and Wales would number 1,000,339 ; and of these, so far as the localities and attendance of schools are ascertained, there would reside in the dioceses of Liverpool and Salford, 321,365 ; in Westminster, 185,631 ; in Birmingham, 96,182 ; in Southwark, 81,352 ; in Beverley, 80,385 ; in Hexham, 70,086 ; in Clifton, 26,317 ; in Shrewsbury, 23,034 ; in Newport, 16,881 ; in Nottingham, 12,791 ; in Plymouth, 8528 ; and in Northampton, 5778. If in any diocese the low numbers so obtained should create surprise and incredulity, it may be inferred that (so far as the Poor-School Committee's returns are exact) the Catholic children of such localities are not adequately supplied with means of education in Catholic schools.

Of the public week-day schools ascertained to exist in England, Catholics support 5·52 in every 100, of Sunday-schools 1·5, and of night-schools 4·76. Such is the general result of the returns. With regard to Protestant schools of all or no denominations, the answers of the various educational societies were tested by minute inquiries in the specimen districts ; but, for the reason already given, this test failed in its application to Catholic schools. Thus Mr. Fraser reports, that "the managers of the Roman Catholic schools refused all information, on the ground that the Commission was unfairly constituted as respects them, by not including any representative of Roman Catholic opinions." And Mr. Winder : "The managers of the Catholic public schools, acting under central orders, alone refused to give information, or to admit me to their schools ; with this exception every school, both public and private, was opened to me." And Mr. Coode : "Throughout the whole inquiry, I have received the ready and even zealous assistance of all classes of persons, and the most free and, as far as I could judge, unreserved statements of facts and expressions of opinion from all persons in any way connected with public schools, with one class-exception only, namely, that of the managers and schoolmasters, mistresses and teachers, of Roman Catholic schools. As to the latter, it is probable that the masters and mistresses and teachers would in all cases—certainly they would in some—have willingly afforded me information, had they not been forbidden by the priest who had the management of the school. Mr. Tyson, the Roman Catholic priest at Sedgley, courteously afforded me the information I desired. . . . I took steps to obtain the information refused in the best way open to me, by the oral report of scholars, of teachers, or of neighbours, who

undertook to make a careful observation and enumeration of the matters in question, all of which I checked by counter information, and by observation on the spot at the time of going to and from school, and in some instances, in the case of Roman Catholic schools, by actual observation of myself and clerks within the schools." Mr. Coode, in short, has a taste for playing the spy. With more grace Mr. Foster: "In two instances, one Protestant, the other Roman Catholic, there was some *ex post facto* displeasure expressed by the patrons of schools because I had obtained information in their absence, and therefore necessarily without their previous concurrence. With these exceptions, my way was every where smooth. The Roman Catholics met me with the greatest politeness, and expressed their regret that the imperative orders of their superiors rendered it impossible for them to give me the required information. With respect to their schools, I was able to obtain very little except the number of children,—a number so small as not perceptibly to affect the general results." To a Roman Catholic lady writing about a school under her management, which she wished him to see, the same gentleman ascribes the smart remark, that "the religious instruction there given was devotional and practical, and did not consist, as in the Protestant schools, of inculcating the exact number of kings that reigned in Israel, or the precise names of Jacob's sons." Again, Mr. Cumin: "The clergy of the Established Church, the Dissenting ministers, the laymen interested in education, and, with few exceptions, the masters of private schools, filled them (forms) up with care and alacrity. The Roman Catholics formed the only exception to this general rule. The masters of such schools in my district declined to receive the forms, or to allow me to enter their schoolrooms officially; and her Majesty's Roman Catholic Inspector, Mr. Marshall, also declined to coöperate or aid in the inquiry." Subsequently, as we shall see further on, Mr. Marshall gave very interesting evidence before the Commission. A pleasant incident, creditable as far as it goes to Roman Catholic teaching, is recorded by Mr. Cumin with a touch of pathos. "I visited the City Library at Bristol in the evening. . . . One boy, very pale and emaciated, but with a beautiful countenance, I stopped. He was a Roman Catholic. His mother received parish relief,—four loaves and two shillings. He attended the Roman Catholic school. I asked him to write from my dictation. He wrote, 'John Terry, No. 5 Upper Lamb Street,—You will endeavour to ascertain,' in a good round hand. The orthography was

correct. He was only twelve." To a statement in the body of his Report that "the managers and teachers of the Roman Catholic schools courteously but peremptorily declined to give me any information concerning them," the next Assistant-Commissioner, Mr. Hare, appends a note: "I received some information as to the number of Roman Catholic schools, the attendance, and other circumstances, but not in a form sufficiently authentic to be reported. In Hull and Sealcoates there are two boys' and two girls' day-schools of the elementary class assisted and inspected, a school of a superior class for girls, and two evening-schools free, besides two sets of Sunday-schools. In Yarmouth there are a day-school and a mixed Sunday-school. In Ipswich I did not hear of any school at all." Of the metropolitan districts, Mr. Wilkinson reports: "In no single instance did I meet with actual hostility or want of politeness. The masters and superintendents of Roman Catholic schools expressed their regret that they were prohibited by the orders of their superiors from giving information. . . . I have been unable to obtain information with respect to the number of scholars in Roman Catholic schools sufficiently authentic to justify me in adding them to my tables; . . . and the information I received orally upon the subject differed so materially from my own observation, that I do not venture to include them in my calculation upon so insufficient data." A foot-note explains: "At St. George's-in-the-East I was informed by the superintending priest that there were from 1800 to 2000 Roman Catholic children at the public schools in the parish. There is a very fine building erected immediately contiguous to the Protestant schools in St. Mary's district. But after giving full credit for this, which I went over, I could not satisfy myself that there were 1000 children in the parish under education. Possibly my informant put a different interpretation upon the word 'parish.' Mr. Marshall's Report gives 536 as the total present in 1853." It is a little remarkable that Mr. Wilkinson, whose Report is dated 1st October 1859, should have gone as far back as 1853 for his figures, unless (as, indeed, appears to have been the case with the Commissioners generally) he was ignorant of the existence of the Tabulated Reports upon individual schools issued from year to year by her Majesty's Inspectors. Mr. Marshall's Tabulated Reports for 1859 give the following numbers as present during inspection in May of that year: in Red Lion Street, Wapping, 200; in the East London School, 191; in Pell Street, St. George's-in-the-East, 454; and in John Street, Commercial Road, 535; making a total

of 1380 scholars in inspected schools. The attendance at other Roman Catholic schools would no doubt make up the number mentioned by the "superintending priest." Finally, Dr. Hodgson enters "thirteen Roman Catholic schools, from none of which was any return received. The number of pupils in the Roman Catholic schools have been taken in most cases from the last-published Report (for 1857) of the Catholic Poor-School Committee; in a few cases it has been estimated from observation on the spot, or from information indirectly obtained. The numbers are probably under-estimated."

If the attendance has not been adequately represented, the financial returns submitted by Catholic schools are so manifestly incomplete as to be quite worthless. Thus the amount of endowment acknowledged by all the Catholic schools of the kingdom stands at 110*l.*; while the whole income of all our schools in Middlesex, independent of Government aid, comes to no more than 300*l.* Catholic Lancashire avows the more respectable revenue of 4968*l.* 19*s.* From Yorkshire and several other counties no returns of income were received. Probably the inveterate habit of concealment, acquired in evil times, blinded managers to the altered circumstances of our day, when wills are all deposited for perusal, and a Board of Commissioners has jurisdiction over Catholic charities. Certainly the public will not gain a high appreciation of the liberality and love for education displayed by the great nobles, and the wealthy proprietors, and the million of commoners, whose accumulated gifts and bequests to Catholic schools for the poor produce the salary of a single schoolmaster. Had the money granted to Catholic schools by the English Government within the last twelve years been funded at four per cent, a revenue of upwards of 3300*l.* a year would have accrued; and the treasured liberality of three centuries of Catholics brings in no more than 110*l.*! Accounts so plainly inexact cannot have been meant to deceive; and it would seem more judicious to withhold them altogether. The statistical clerks of the Royal Commission may—it is within the limits of possibility—have suppressed some of the returns, or otherwise reduced the figures. Explanation and apology should, if so, be sternly demanded. It is no light matter that doubt has been thrown upon the financial returns of Catholic school-managers at the very moment when they are about to be intrusted with the local administration of the Government grant for education.

Want of opportunity to visit and examine Catholic schools led the Assistant-Commissioners into an error which a li-

mitted experience would have served to dissipate. They seem to agree in reporting that, while Catholic children are found in Protestant schools, Protestant parents will not allow their sons to frequent the schools of Catholics. In all schools (Church, Wesleyan, and British) in Bradford and Rochdale, children of all denominations are mixed up together. Roman Catholics and Wesleyans, Churchmen and Independents, Baptists and Indifferents, sit at the same desks, and submit without remonstrance or disapproval to the prescribed religious routine. What is called the religious difficulty is unknown to the population of Durham and Cumberland, except in the case of the Roman Catholics, many of whom withhold their children from Protestant schools, but this avowedly in obedience to their priests, and not of their own choice. "I have seen," says Mr. Cumin of Bristol and Plymouth, "the sons of Jews and Roman Catholics in Church schools, the sons of Churchmen attending a Church Sunday-school and a Unitarian week-day school. The mass of the poor have no notion as to any distinction beyond that between Roman Catholics and Protestants. In various conversations with workmen, I have often put the question whether they would object to send their children to a Church school though they were Dissenters, or to a Dissenting school though they were Churchmen. The answer has invariably been in the negative. Upon pursuing the inquiry further, I found that if there was none but a Roman Catholic school in the neighbourhood, *they would send them to no school at all!*" And Mr. Coode reports of the Potteries that "the genuine, unstimulated opinion of the lower classes of parents who desire education for their children appears to me to be universally a simple desire for a good, useful, plain education, with little care about religious distinctions of doctrine or discipline, except only so far that Protestant parents of all classes avoid the Roman Catholic schools, and Roman Catholic parents nearly as generally avoid Protestant schools of all denominations." Of Hull, Yarmouth, and Ipswich, Mr. Hare speaks less positively: "Every where I have found Jews in Christian, and Roman Catholics in Protestant schools; Nonconformists in National schools, and Church children in British or positively Dissenting schools. The only Jews' school which I have discovered contained Jews alone; but" (he adds with astonishment) "I have evidence that the Roman Catholic schools in Hull are not without some mixture of Protestant children. With the mass of the people the question of religious belief rarely enters their heads in choosing or refusing a school. The Hull and Sealcoates witnesses make one ex-

ception. The Protestant feeling is strong in that town, yet neither so strong nor so unanimously represented as to prevent Roman Catholics from remaining in Protestant schools after the opening of schools of their own denomination, or Protestant children finding their way into schools managed by Roman Catholic priests and Sisters of Mercy. . . . The Roman Catholics in Ipswich take, ostensibly, no part in public education, while some of their children may be found in existing schools." The Hull Protestants, indeed, unless they are maligned, would furnish Mr. J. S. Mill with an apt illustration of middle-class notions of liberty ; for they cherish a "special opposition to the grant of public money to Roman Catholic schools as such." Probably the flourishing condition of the schools, and the number of Protestant children in them, excite this bilious antipathy. The liberality of practice, on the other hand, which private Catholic schools in London exhibit, cannot be justified even by the penury of their teachers. "The Church Catechism," says Mr. Wilkinson, "is the only recognised formulary in several Dissenting and in two Roman Catholic private schools ; not that it was pressed upon the scholars, but it was the only catechism recognised." And he gives details from his experience :—as of Mr. C., an intelligent and capable master, who keeps a large boys' school in a dirty building, and has six or seven Roman Catholics, Jews, and Dissenters among his scholars. He uses the Church Catechism, but does not force it. And again of Mrs. D., who, in a respectable school at 6*d.* a week, has three Roman Catholic children removed from the Catholic schools. They learn Church Catechism, parents not objecting. She has seven Jews, who do not come on Saturday. Also Mrs. N., ten years schoolmistress, formerly in service as housekeeper, has Dissenters of all classes, Roman Catholics, and Jewesses among her scholars. The Church Catechism is her only class-book, but she does not teach it to them. Finally, we read of Mrs. O., who keeps a good school, and has all sorts of persuasions among her scholars. She sends to know if parents approve of Scripture being taught, and if not does not teach them. Her experience is, that religious differences are not at all regarded by parents ; but she complains that the Sisters of Mercy who have recently established a school near her, ascertained the names and residences of her children, and bribed many away from her to teach them for nothing. These examples are taken from one of the poor districts of St. Pancras, but they could be matched in other parishes. Most pitiful indeed is the description of a private school in London, sketched by Dr. Hodgson. "Mr. —.

Males, 12 ; females, 2. This school is held in probably the most miserable place I have yet seen, at the top of a very steep and broken staircase, and in a room more like a carpenter's shop than a schoolroom. It is impossible to describe the poverty and decay which every thing indicated. The chief text-book seemed to be a kitten, to which all the children were very attentive. The room is small and unventilated ; window dirty. Mr. — is a young man, very pale and sickly in appearance, born in this country ; a Roman Catholic, and most of his pupils, if not all, are of the same faith. Between school-hours he does carpenter's work at the desk and benches, which he is fitting up. He expressed a strong wish to have an arithmetic-book and a grammar, for his own improvement. I promised to send him both. His mother keeps a marine store on the ground-floor." Is there no one to seek out this pale and sickly young man in his wretched garret, with the view of helping him to something better than an arithmetic-book and a grammar ? But to return to our argument. One Commissioner, as we have seen, obtained evidence that the Roman Catholic schools in Hull are not without some mixture of Protestant children. Another, the Rev. J. Fraser, reports that "the Roman Catholic school at Belmont, near Hereford, admits the children of Protestant parents on the distinct pledge of not interfering with their religious opinions ; and there were Protestant children being instructed in the school of the same persuasion at Axminster." How, then, can Mr. Cumin, who was not allowed to enter the Catholic schools, dare to assert of the working-classes, that if there was none but a Roman Catholic school in the neighbourhood, they would send their children to no school at all ? or Mr. Coode, that Protestant parents of all classes avoid the Roman Catholic schools ?

The truth is, that the instructions to Assistant-Commissioners demanded more than the weakness of human nature can give. These gentlemen were morally unable to dismiss prejudices and conclusions from their minds. The two clergymen transparently reflect the views of their class ; another Commissioner is a philanthropist, for ever babbling of *his* schools and *his* charitable institutions ; a fourth is a philosopher, shocked at the exclusion of schools which teach only those great laws of Nature and Providence which all men, Protestant and Catholic, Trinitarian and Unitarian, Christian and Jew, alike recognise ; while of Mr. Cumin and Mr. Coode we will only say, that, having assuredly allowed themselves in this matter to be influenced by a controversial bias, so, in the words of their instructions, the value of their

investigations has been entirely destroyed: for, excluded from Catholic schools, and unable to obtain positive evidence, they take upon themselves to report the negative assertion that Protestant children do not attend Catholic schools, and rather than do so would go to no school at all. How many witnesses will establish this negative to Mr. Cumin's satisfaction? Is it not to his prepossession rather than to his evidence that he gives ear? They who have *not* been excluded from Catholic schools know well that Protestant children *are* often found in them. Mr. Marshall, her Majesty's Inspector of Schools, in one of his official reports to the Privy Council, truly affirms that "it very frequently happens, and especially in the midland and northern counties, that for various reasons,—sometimes from a notion that greater advantages are to be obtained, sometimes as a matter of convenience, and perhaps not unfrequently from mere caprice,—the parents of Protestant children are desirous that they should be instructed in a Catholic school. In a very few cases, and from particular causes, they even form the majority of the regular attendants." And in giving evidence before the Royal Commissioners, the same gentleman bears similar testimony. "*Mr. Rogers.* Do you find at all that in the good Roman Catholic schools Protestants are drawn in?—Not so much in London; first, perhaps, because the different denominations look after them too carefully; but I have seen schools which have been largely composed of Protestant children from that cause. *Mr. Rogers.* If the school is a good one, the parents do not regard the religious instruction, but only the goodness of the school?—They do not seem to care much about the religion one way or the other; but I know many country schools in which perhaps half the children are Protestants, entirely owing to the good character of the schools. The most remarkable case which I know is that of a large manufacturing town in Yorkshire, where, when I first visited the school, there was nothing remarkable in it, and there were fifty or sixty children; they have been obliged twice to more than double the size of it. It is not in my district. Two-thirds of the children are Protestants, who leave their own schools two miles behind, where they would pay nothing, and pay sixpence a week to us. They are admitted as a very great favour; for the manager told me that he never admitted them without keeping them waiting a month or two; and they pay sixpence or a shilling a week, from the notion which prevails that it is a very good school." Even Mr. Lingen, the Secretary of the Education Board, is able to acquaint the Commission, that

“with regard to girls, for whom the Roman Catholic schools provide excellent instruction, I have heard that Protestant girls are not unfrequently sent to Roman Catholic schools.” But the Barnsley School is not a girls’ but a boys’ school, and it is in evidence that two-thirds of the scholars are Protestants, attracted by the excellence of the instruction, and seeking admission as a high favour in preference to schools of their own.

We have, then, this array of facts. Wherever the Assistant-Commissioners, all but universally shut out of Catholic schools, got admission to them, or obtained information, as at Belmont, Axminster, and Hull, there they found and reported the presence of Protestant scholars. Her Majesty’s Inspector has attested that Protestant parents are frequently desirous of sending their children to Catholic schools, that in a few cases the Protestant children even form the majority, and in a special instance two-thirds, of the attendants. Moreover, the Privy Council is aware of the circumstance and its explanation. Yet Mr. Cumin, after conversations with two or three, or (shall we say ?) a dozen workmen, has the temerity to assert the universal negative that Protestant parents will not send their children to Catholic schools, and if there were none but a Roman Catholic school in the neighbourhood, would send them to no school at all !

And Mr. Coode makes the same assertion of the Potteries, that Protestant parents of all classes avoid the Catholic schools. There is no district in England where the working-man displays more independence of conduct, and less subservience to clerical influences, than in the Staffordshire Potteries. The Catholic schools are fairly numerous and flourishing, with an estimated attendance of nearly 1000 scholars. The popularity and liberal practice of a deceased priest led, in one particular district, to the Catholic baptism of large numbers of the children of Protestant parents. We believe that the announcement of a sermon by Father Faber or Dr. Northcote would at any time fill the largest church in the Potteries with an audience half Protestant. That in such a population the Protestant parents of all classes should avoid the Roman Catholic schools, would be a striking fact indeed. But we are informed the fact is far otherwise. Up to the time of Mr. Coode’s inquiry, there had been for some years at Cobridge a Catholic boys’ school of high repute, and largely attended by Protestant children, in consideration for whom lessons were not suspended on days of obligation. In the Catholic boys’ school at Longton, we are told that a third of the scholars are Protestants, and

that want of accommodation alone limits their number. But, not to multiply needless proofs, it is manifest that, without visiting the Catholic schools, Mr. Coode has ventured on an assertion which could only be made with truth after a diligent examination of them.

The general question is of no slight importance ; for if Protestant parents really withhold their children every where from Catholic schools, one or both of two causes must be in operation. Either Catholic schools must be so badly conducted and poorly taught as to offer no attractions to scholars ; or the principles and practices of the Catholic religion must be so universally abhorred as in all cases to overcome the attractions of a good education ; or Catholics have no good schools, and if they had, are too generally hated to draw scholars to them. Assuming some such first principle as this, the two Assistant-Commissioners readily conclude that Protestant children never attend Catholic schools ; but in thus arguing they must be allowed to have violated the first condition of their appointment, and to have proved themselves quite unqualified for the patient conduct of a delicate investigation.

Mr. Coode's description of Catholicity in Dudley will illustrate his animus. "The Roman Catholic body here," he says, "includes no gentry, nor persons of the middle rank, but consists wholly of the lowest class of labourers, very few of whom are permanent residents, and whom their clergy, with few exceptions, of which the late priest Mr. Moore was a very worthy one, keep jealously separate from all efforts in which the other religious bodies take, as religious communities, any part. The repulsion appears to be reciprocal ; for the other parties display very little of that tolerance towards the Roman Catholics that otherwise so honourably distinguishes the conduct both of ministers and flocks towards one another. The Roman Catholic labourers very generally perform the very rudest part in all labours in which they are engaged. They work together, resort to the same quarter, the worst in the town, and to the same places of amusement, and generally, whether for good or ill, neither much influence nor are influenced by the work-people of other creeds, while all these are mingled in their dwellings, in their work, and in their amusements, without distinction of creed. Under the circumstances of the Roman Catholic population resorting to Dudley, it was scarcely possible to effect much for the school education of their children. A Roman Catholic school at Sedgley is in a somewhat better condition ; but the difficulty found in Dudley in edu-

cating the Roman Catholic population is nearly the same here."

The assumption, disguised as an inference, that Catholic schools neither deserve nor obtain the attendance of any children not Catholics, would lead to a practical conclusion of serious injustice. For in the case of new Catholic schools to be built with Government aid, if only Catholics will ever seek education therein, then, in assigning a grant, it becomes the duty of the Privy Council to make precise inquiries into the number of Catholic children in the locality, and, further, to investigate whether Catholics are there a growing or diminishing body. Minute inquiries of this kind are needless when the fact has been acknowledged that well-conducted Catholic schools, if not filled by Catholic children or rendered exclusive by some local peculiarity, every where secure the attendance of a certain number of Protestant children. Any surplusage of room is so much gained for general education.

Nor do we shrink from a discussion of the treatment accorded to Protestant scholars in Catholic schools. It is a question which ought to be raised and settled, and materials for answering it are at hand. So far back as 1849, it appeared to Mr. Marshall right to inquire what was the position of Protestants in Catholic schools, and how far they were subject to the special influences and instructions which their companions are not permitted to decline. The universal rule he reports to be, that "in no case do they receive religious instruction without the express sanction or request of their parents, and that either they are at liberty to absent themselves from the school altogether when it is communicated, or else the Catholic children are withdrawn to some convenient place, commonly to the church or chapel, in order to be instructed apart. The first susceptibility of religious professions," he adds, "is thus duly consulted and respected, and they who demand liberty of conscience as their own most cherished right are careful to avoid the criminal inconsistency of violating that sacred privilege in their dealings with others." During his examination before the Commissioners in December 1859, Mr. Marshall does not speak so positively upon the point. In answer to a remark of Sir J. Coleridge, that the Protestant children in Roman Catholic schools of course get the same religious instruction as the Roman Catholic children do, he replies: "That is a point to which I have paid a great deal of attention, and there is no rule. There are many of our schools where the parents are told, 'We will teach your child, if you like, but it will be

taught exactly the same as any other children.' In some cases that is not insisted on, and I have known more than one case of pupil-teachers in our schools who entered them Protestants, and quitted them Protestants; but those are exceptions." And when further asked if the Roman Catholic Church, by her authorities, lays down any stringent rule that it is necessary for children receiving the secular education at a Roman Catholic school to receive the religious education also, he answers: "No; it leaves a discretion to the local managers, who either impose the religious instruction or not, as they think fit." At the close of his evidence, the Commissioners suppose the Privy Council to put a condition on aid to Catholic schools, and to say, "Unless you will consent to receive Protestant children, and allow them to be absent from religious instruction, we will not afford you any help;" and they ask what effect such a rule would have. With great decision, Mr. Marshall testifies that "the effect of it would be, that we should not accept it; we would never accept the Irish system; the effect of the introduction of any such principle with us would be to withdraw every Catholic school from public aid, absolutely and finally." Such, very possibly, was the private opinion and anticipation of the witness; but, however well-informed and qualified from long experience to speak of the condition of inspected schools, Mr. Marshall certainly had no authority to promulgate an ecclesiastical decision, still less to upset and reverse a decision deliberately made and solemnly communicated to the State by the English Bishops. For the regulation hypothetically suggested by the Commissioners was in fact a condition precedent to the admission of Catholic schools to public aid, and to the appointment of a Catholic inspector. Ample documentary evidence exists to prove that the question of the admission and treatment of Protestant children in Roman Catholic schools was at the earliest moment mooted by the Government, considered by the Catholic representatives, and authoritatively arranged between the high contracting parties. It was in February 1847 when the Catholic Institute, the immediate precursor of the Poor-School Committee, made the first formal application for aid towards the erection of Catholic schools, that Lord Lansdowne, then President of the Council, directed the Secretary of the Education Department to inquire whether it was proposed that the schools intended to be erected for the instruction of Roman Catholic children should be open to children of Protestant parents. If the school was intended to be exclusively for children of Roman Catholic descent, his

lordship desired to be informed by what regulations poor children of Protestant parents were to be excluded. If the school was to be opened indiscriminately to all children who might seek admission, whether of Roman Catholic or Protestant descent, his lordship desired to be informed whether the religious and the secular instruction of the scholars were to be given at the same or at different hours. In either case, his lordship wished to know whether it was proposed to adopt any, and, if so, what, practical arrangements by which none but children of Roman Catholic parents would be permitted to be present during religious instruction in the proposed schools. These searching inquiries were too grave for an off-hand reply. They were submitted to the Vicars-Apostolic, and discussed at the next Easter meeting. Upon the 14th April following, Bishop Walsh wrote to Mr. Langdale, from Golden Square, in these terms :

“The Bishops assembled instruct me to thank you for a copy of the letter of W. Kay Shuttleworth, Esq., to you, of the 18th Feb. They have given their best consideration to its important contents. They beg respectfully to state that, on receiving a grant from Government for our charity schools, it is not intended to make them exclusive, so as to prevent the admission of children of Protestant parents or guardians. In case the children of Protestant parents should resort to our schools, they will not be required to remain in the school at the time of religious instruction being given, unless their parents or guardians have previously expressed their consent and approbation.”

Nothing could be plainer or more decided. Protestant children were to be admitted, and were not to receive religious instruction without the consent of their parents. Such is the Bishop's pledge in 1847. It may, of course, be argued that a casual meeting of Bishops in London has no synodical authority, and that the decisions of such meetings do not bind ; and, moreover, that, had the Bishops seriously proposed to carry the undertaking into practice, each of them would have promulgated disciplinary regulations for his own diocese ; or, again, that the new hierarchy is under no obligation to observe the joint resolutions of former Vicars-Apostolic. Some visionary might even be found to plead that the promise of the Bishops was *ultra vires*, contrary to the Divine law, and essentially void and without effect. Canonists may settle such questions ; but surely, as between man and man, upon any maxims which render society possible, by every rule of integrity, Catholics are obliged either honourably to fulfil Bishop Walsh's pledge, or openly, and through an official medium, to repudiate it.

But perhaps it may be imagined that the resolution of the assembled Bishops was never communicated to the Government. Far otherwise. In conformity with the understanding come to, Colonel Keppel, upon 25th May 1847, writing on behalf of Lord J. Russell, proposed to the Catholic Institute a basis for minutes designed to extend public assistance to Roman Catholic schools, and among the terms was the following: "Children whose parents conscientiously object to the religious instruction to be permitted to partake of the secular instruction without attending at the hours of religious instruction." The Catholic Institute again consulted the Vicars-Apostolic, and at last, upon 25th June, with due deliberation, they presented to the Premier a formal and very lengthy document, in which, after premising that "the admission of other than Roman Catholic children for the purposes of instruction into Roman Catholic schools is considered secondary to the accommodation in the first place of Roman Catholic children," and after a distinct and very becoming declaration, that "religion is the pervading principle of all instruction given to children in Roman Catholic schools," they conclude that, "if Lord J. Russell intends to refer by the term 'religious' to what the Committee feel persuaded his lordship must allude to, namely, to catechetical instruction on the doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church, they have no difficulty in not only sanctioning, but insisting on a principle so much in accordance with the dictates of their holy religion, that children whose parents conscientiously object thereto should not be required to attend during the time of such catechetical instruction." There can therefore be no doubt of the preliminary condition under which Catholic schools were admitted to share in Government grants, and as little about the considerable sums which they have now derived from that source; and we are deeply concerned to find Mr. Marshall reporting of the Yorkshire schools, where two-thirds of the children are Protestants, and where Government grants amount to nearly 2000*l.*, that "all the children learn the same catechism, and practise the same devotions, and lead, in short, the same religious life." Let us hope that all their parents and guardians have previously expressed their consent and approbation of the religious life and the catechetical instruction.

The last phrase will introduce an extract from one of the metropolitan Assistants, with which for the present we must close our incomplete notice of the Royal Commission and its consequences.

"I took down the following passages from the address of the

priest at one of the few Roman Catholic Sunday-schools I visited. I quote it, of course, without reference to any doctrinal differences, but simply as a specimen of what an educated and able man (for I can speak favourably not only of his reputation, but of the state of his school) thought adapted to the intelligence of children, the oldest of whom was not seventeen.

‘Plato, commenting on Socrates, thought he would go to heaven because he was so clever, and saw through the errors of the pagan system ; but St. Augustine, who, you know, my children, is one of the revered Fathers of our Church, had great doubts whether he could be saved, because he did not believe in Jesus Christ. . . .

‘Suffer death ; yes, at the cross, rather than commit mortal sin. You may be nearer carrying the principle into practice than you believe. There is a strong opinion, which has gained ground among pious and reflecting people, that shortly before the close of the world, some think in three years, there will come a terrible time of persecution. Antichrist will be permitted to be triumphant for a time, and you may be called upon to testify, as the saints of old, with your lives.’”

THE LIFE OF DR. DOYLE.*

(Second Notice.)

THE second volume of Mr. Fitz-Patrick's Biography of Dr. Doyle records the last seven years of a life which constitutes a chapter in the annals of Ireland. In many respects this is the most interesting part of his careful and valuable work. The great struggle for Emancipation was over, it is true, at an early period in those last seven years ; but other questions possessing not less of an inward significance, and more immediately spiritual in their bearings, arose in its place. Some of these questions—that of education, for instance, and those connected with the proselytising movement—were new only so far as circumstances had modified them. They had been assuming more and more of importance ever since the relaxation of the penal laws. In proportion as men become possessed of political privileges, and of that freedom which is even more a trust than it is a privilege, they require imperatively a corresponding advance in their intellectual and moral culture to fit them for their new duties. In proportion as those chains were broken to which an earlier period of tyranny had looked for the suppression of the Catholic

* The Life, Times, and Correspondence of the Right Rev. Dr. Doyle, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin. By William John Fitz-Patrick. James Duffy, Dublin and London.

Church in Ireland, the zealots of a later day endeavoured to effect by polemical efforts, and an indirect coercion, what the coarser instruments devised by political animosity had broken in trying to effect. Innumerable efforts were made, sometimes by very sincere and charitable persons, sometimes by bigots, in whom sectarian animosities were sharpened by that prescient instinct which forbodes a coming doom,—efforts to change the faith of the people, or rather to substitute for that faith the changeful and ill-digested theological opinions of an established Sect. Such efforts were often met by anger, and often by scorn : they were not wholly unattended by success, though of a very trivial and transitory character ; but Dr. Doyle at once perceived how they were to be rendered harmless, nay, turned into a lasting advantage.

The time, he perceived, had come when the organisation which the Church alone can supply, and a true Catholic enlightenment, were to preoccupy that ground which an officious zeal and a false enlightenment aspired to take possession of. He looked to a deep and wide Catholic education as the great work of the age. Every period, he knew, has its own dangers and exemptions, its own diseases and medicines. Persecution had in its fiercer day assailed the Catholics of Ireland as a body, and as a body they had banded themselves passively against the oppressor, waiting God's time. That oppressor was, in many cases, far from desiring either to convert or to educate a subject race, which he regarded as helpless in proportion as it was degraded, and which, if elevated, would probably expect, like the English farmer or labourer, a larger proportion of the fruits of the soil—perhaps even a share in the government of his country. The new trial was of an opposite character. A poor and weak peasantry were called on to discuss logical and theological questions with controversialists in whose hands were the weapons of the strong, and who, if not well informed, had at least monopolised that provision set apart in ancient times for the instruction and consolation of a people. It is proverbially not easy, even for a philosopher, to “argue with the master of forty legions.” The peasant was here withdrawn from the collective body and assailed individually ; and his defence could only be effectually found in the clearness as well as the strength of his individual convictions, even when deprived of such support as the convictions of the poor commonly derive from social traditions and from national sympathies. Dr. Doyle also, foreseeing that an end was assuredly approaching, not only to the thralldom of his country, but likewise to those circumstances which had long kept her in unex-

amplified poverty, foresaw no less clearly that prosperity, whenever it came, would bring with it temptations unknown to adversity. It is less hard to despise the world when it affronts us than when its allurements are laid at our feet. It is comparatively easy to realise things unseen when the sphere of sense does not assume for us its more brilliant array. The cloak which the storm could not blow away is flung aside, as the fable teaches, when the sun beats on us. If the poor themselves may be endangered by such prosperity as is theirs at times, if the prayer for daily and heavenly bread may lose somewhat of its fervour on the lips of men in humble life whose granaries are well stored, how much greater must the temptation prove to the class immediately above them ! How easy for a man, if not strong-minded or deep-hearted, to become, for the first time, ashamed of his religion, and disposed to contract for himself a separate peace, when the restoration of that wealth and social position of which he has long been unjustly deprived brings him into unwonted contact with persons his superiors in education and self-confidence, though possibly his inferiors in antiquity of race, as well as in all that relates to religion ! Dr. Doyle, as the battle advanced to the victory, never even in the heat of conflict forgot the new and more urgent needs which victory itself must call forth. As he built with the sword in one hand, so he fought without relaxing his grasp of the Book, and he pressed the Crucifix ever closer to his heart as the event became less doubtful. In education he provided for such dangers as assailed his flock through the intellect ; in the ancient conventual institutions which he defended, and those of later date which he introduced into his diocese, he provided those spiritual weapons, "tempered in the armoury of God," the keen edge of which cannot be blunted by the resistance of the most materialistic or the most Epicurean age ; in his new cathedral, the stately walls of which astonished those who had worshiped in huts, as their fathers had worshiped in caves, he compelled the things that are visible to render homage to Him who is a Spirit, and thus strengthened men through the imagination itself against the weakness into which they are betrayed by a dazzled or a corrupted imagination ; and while thus peacefully militant, he carried that other war which he had not provoked into the aggressor's camp, and replied to tracts intended to puzzle peasants by pamphlets, each of which descended like a shell amid the circle of astonished theologians.

It is thus that a man who is truly great, while doing the work of the day, rises unconsciously above the needs of

his own day alone. He belongs to all time, and the future is a part of his inheritance. But for such men the just cause would sometimes lose more by the sudden removal of oppression than it had previously suffered from the oppression itself. Its representatives would be found unfit for their new position and their new duties, and consequently their new privileges would but become a snare to them. On the other hand, there would undoubtedly rise up men, at the opposite side, who had inherited, not created, an unjust order of things, and who for that reason had not become wholly vitiated by it. Deprived of their former enervating props, the more wary, if not the wiser, for experience, and braver, if not humbler, for adversity,—such men would resolutely do the best for a bad cause. Mr. Landor, in one of his most striking “Imaginary Conversations,” puts the following words into the mouth of Cicero while commenting, in the sadness of vain retrospect, on the war between Cæsar and Pompey and the downfall of the republic: “The Gods, as if the more to perplex us, had placed the best men upon the worst side.” This is far from being always the case when the best side is yet the side that loses; but something like this has sometimes chanced when the best side, though it has emerged from calamity, fails to carry out its victory. The slowness with which, in such a case, the just cause reaches its full exterior consummation may in such cases be providentially designed in order that its political progress may not too far outrun the intellectual, or the intellectual the spiritual. In these things a proportion must ever be kept. In a youth, if the bodily growth, without being in itself excessive, were yet to outrun the mental, the result would be one full of danger. Something of this sort is true of a nation. To them also the adage, “more haste, less speed,” sometimes applies. It was a proof alike of Dr. Doyle’s wisdom and patriotism, that he so clearly discerned the conditions under which alone his country could rapidly reap the fruit of her long vigils and matchless endurance. He neither railed at his adversaries nor despised them. He did them full, nay generous, justice, if the expression may be admitted; but he encountered and overthrew them. They learned from him that moderation is not weakness, and that dignity is not apathy.

Mr. Fitz-Patrick gives us a very amusing account* of the excitement produced in 1827 by the movement which was announced as the “second Reformation of Ireland,” an account all the more trustworthy for the ample

* Vol. ii. p. 2.

allowance which, like Dr. Doyle, he makes for the credulous supporters of the enterprise :

“ ‘ Weekly bulletins of the number of new converts from Popery,’ writes Mr. O'Neill Daunt, ‘ were placarded on the walls, and suspended round the necks of persons hired to perambulate the public streets. Fourteen hundred and eighty-three converts were at one period announced as the fruit of Lord Farnham's exertions in Cavan ; but when Archbishop Magee went down to confirm them, their numbers had shrunk to forty-two. He kept open house for proselytes, who were furnished with soup, potatoes, and, in some instances, with clothes.’ ”

Dr. Doyle, in whose diocese, that very year, 248 conversions to Catholicism really took place, wrote a pamphlet on this occasion, addressed to Lord Farnham, in which he

“ dealt severely with the Irish temporal establishment ; but his views were hardly stronger than those which had been already expressed by Lords Brougham, Macaulay, John Russell, and the Rev. Sydney Smith.”

To this list Mr. Fitz-Patrick might have added many more names, such as those of Earl Grey and Dr. Arnold. To Lord Farnham's apprehensions of danger from the concession of the Catholic claims, Dr. Doyle replied by asking him whether he saw no danger from their rejection. On this subject Mr Fitz-Patrick gives us some very remarkable information, not generally accessible, but with which the Duke of Wellington is said to have become acquainted, respecting a

“ force of 40,000 men, which, headed by General Montgomery, the son of an Irish refugee in America, was intended for the invasion of Ireland, had Emancipation continued to be withheld.”*

To all such enterprises, as to all Ribbon conspiracies, Dr. Doyle was ever the most determined opponent. Loyalty was with him an essential part of Catholicism ; but with him loyalty did not mean servility to disloyal laws, still less to Governments of the day which, at the same time perhaps, express sympathy with rebellion abroad and maintain oppression at home. He concludes,

“ I would say, my lord, to you,—every Catholic should say it to every Protestant—every liberator should say it to every Orangeman—every priest to every parson,—‘ *Jungamus dexteras*,’ let us unite our hands, let us rally round the throne, and, inviting our sovereign to govern us by just and equal laws, enable him to exclaim, in defiance before the face of all the world, the words of Christian fortitude engraved on his crest, *Dieu et mon droit* !”†

Soon afterwards Dr. Doyle published another pamphlet of 146 pages, in reply to a pastoral charge by Archbishop Magee. In place of referring further to it, we must hasten on and present our readers with some illustrations of the Bishop's zeal in favour of education. In February 1827, he took a large part in the establishment of the "Catholic Book Society of Dublin;" a society instituted for the publication and the diffusion of moral and religious books suited especially to the exigencies of the day. Dr. Doyle was the first prelate, after the Archbishop of Dublin, to give his efficient support to this society (one which would be quite as useful in our day as it proved in his), and wrote an address on its objects and advantages.* On the 24th of November in the same year, he put forward one of his favourite plans, that for the formation of a model school, in which science should be made to promote the spiritual interests of the Catholic faith, by making her sons more fit for the battle of life, as in the Middle Ages she had furthered those interests by rendering the Aristotelian logic the organ of Christian theology, and as the railway of a later day is destined to discover its nobler vocation in the aid which it furnishes to the Mission of the Cross.

"The instruction he proposed to impart was to comprise the theory and practice of design, abridgments of natural history, elements of mathematics, including algebra, proportion, something of logarithms, geometry, and some plane and spherical trigonometry, even a little of conic sections, and a tincture of chemistry. What is greatly wanted is a supply of masters well instructed in the elements of science, above all, in mathematics, who would develop and form the immense mass of talent always to be found among the middling class of society in Ireland. There is no benefit which the Catholic Association could confer upon the country comparable to the establishment, on a broad basis, of a model school. If this were attempted, and the attempt made with sobriety, discretion, and zeal, I have no doubt but it would receive aid from men of all parties, who, differing on many things, are agreed in their love of Ireland. It would be the means of preparing for generations yet to come more individual wealth, knowledge, happiness, power, and fame, than any other measure which could be undertaken with equal ease in Ireland."†

In the year 1829 Dr. Doyle resumed this momentous subject in a letter to O'Connell.

"If it can be accomplished, a greater good will, in my opinion, be prepared for Ireland than is likely to result from any of the numerous projects undertaken of late years for her advantage. A bold peasantry, it is true, is a nation's strength; but an educated people

* Vol. ii. p. 2.

† p. 44.

will be free and bold and opulent. The country possessed by such a people will have within her a fund of virtue, of invention, of energy, and power, which can never be exhausted. Hence we find that all those great men who created empires, organised governments, framed useful laws, and, as it were, founded on a firm basis public morality and Divine worship, considered the establishment of literary institutions as the glory of their age, and the most lasting advantage conferred by them upon their people. . . . Dr. Doyle complained that Ireland, with eight millions of inhabitants, possessed but one university, and that four at least would be required. The religious tests and exclusions of the existing university were, he submitted, a libel upon its very name ; for a university, to be such, should not confine its advantages to any particular class. She should not, whatever her system of instruction might be, devote herself almost exclusively, as ours had done, to preparing a limited number of gentlemen for the learned professions, or close practically her doors against the middling classes of the people.”*

So long ago as the year 1768 various persons of influence and patriotism united in an attempt to found a scientific institute serviceable to Ireland. Strangely enough, their counsellor on this occasion was a Catholic and a Jesuit. His name was Joseph Fenn. He was a man of eminent mathematical and philosophical acquirements ; but he was persecuted till he became deranged ; his days were ended in a madhouse, and his name is all but forgotten in the land he laboured to serve. The institution which he helped to found (the Dublin Society) survives. Its benefits were not, however, so widely diffused as to satisfy conceptions like those cherished by Dr. Doyle. His aspirations were,

“ To work the immense mine of human talent which lies buried in Ireland, to separate the fine ore from the baser metals which encompass it, to bring it forth, and enrich by its aid, not only this country, but every country on the habitable globe. Our ancestors once peopled Scotland ; they afterwards civilised and taught it to believe in one only true God. These Scots became a people equally signalised for their virtues and their crimes ; but since educated on, in these latter ages, subdued their fiercer passions, they cultivated literature, so that ‘ their staple commodity was said to be learning, and their chief export to be learned men.’ Thus trade enriched them ; their bravery and determination had already made them free. Let us learn from these our descendants, not how to change the barren moor into a meadow, or to fertilise the mountain,—for nature has exempted us from this unwholesome toil,—but to cultivate our talents, to educate our people, to acquire and secure our freedom, and to possess in peace and security the abundance with which our country teems ;—let it be our object, not to export learning for gain,

or send forth the needy scholar to forage India or the Cape for gold, but let us call forth, from wheresoever he may be found, the apostle to carry the light of religion to him who is in darkness, the philosopher to guide the councils of nations, the men of letters to occupy the seats of learning, as we did formerly throughout Europe.”*

With this splendid prospect he thus contrasts the condition of a country which does not know what she may be because she forgets what she has been :

“ Let us take a single captive, and view him in this prison of the soul, incapable almost of counting, by notches, the days of his captivity. Let us view him seated amidst the ruins of one of his ancient cities, on the site of some decayed temple, amazed at the grandeur of its mouldering arches, but ignorant perhaps that the very soil existed a century before. Let him only be made acquainted with the history of his country ; let her heroes, her saints, and her sages pass in review before his enraptured imagination ; let the chiding spirit of one of her great orators point out to him the mighty wreck of his country,—and the gloomy melancholy will confer more real pleasure than the sceptre of a monarch could bestow : but the effects will not stop here ; he will be aroused from his lethargy ; he will vindicate his own rights and those of his country, or enrich her with the products of his labour or his art.”†

It is thus that the records of old times have ministered to the greatness of other countries,—to that of England and of Scotland no less than to that of Greece and of Italy. If there be statesmen who imagine that from the education of that country alone for which Dr. Doyle struggled the annals of the past should be excluded, let them seriously ask themselves whether, considering that the histories of all nations abound with instances of wrong which have long since been forgiven, and which now excite no jealousy, it may not be something in the present, more than in the past, of Ireland which makes a true knowledge of her history more disquieting to her rulers than the appeals of the loudest demagogue. If this be the case, the remedy will be found in equal laws, ecclesiastical as well as civil, not in a vain endeavour to keep the secret which every one knows, and to create that monster in the political world—a nation as much without recollections as though it were a colony.

We have seen how wholly free were Dr. Doyle's opinions on education from narrowness, and from that which is often denounced as priestcraft by men who are slow to observe that there is also such a thing as statecraft in the world. Like the greatest Catholic theologians, he feared not science, but ignorance ; and with reference to the secular part of instruction,

* Vol. ii. p. 143.

† p. 144.

his language was as liberal and unexact as that used in recent times by the hierarchy of his country in those parts of their pastorals which do not treat of religious instruction, and which the newspapers have not always found it convenient to quote. Did he think, therefore, that secular instruction was ever, in a single case, to be disconnected from religious, or that the latter, which alone elevates instruction into education, and but for which the former would prove destructive alike to the State and to the people, should be allowed, if any, at least a subordinate place? It is thus that he speaks on this subject in an address to his flock :

“In all these schools religion shall be the first and the last occupation of the child—to raise his pure hands to Heaven ; as it is the first duty assigned him by his Creator, so shall it be the groundwork of all the instruction he may receive. Religion shall not be banished, like some dangerous infection, from our schools. The child shall not be taught to hide the summary of the law of God, to commune with Heaven by stealth, to deceive some petulant inspector, and shield his piety by a lie. No ; in our schools religious instruction shall be the basis of education ; and this religious instruction will embrace whatever can contribute to mould the heart to virtue, to subdue the passions, to regulate the affections, and prepare the mind of the child for that world full of danger into which, on leaving school, he is obliged to enter.”*

Dr. Doyle's opinions have been represented, doubtless without any intention to colour them unduly, as of a character very different from that which will be attributed to them by a careful reader of these volumes. Dr. Doyle was a man of moderation, and for that very reason would have shunned the Erastian extreme, as well as any other extreme, on such subjects. The great importance of the subject will serve as a sufficient excuse for our dwelling upon it a little longer

It is painful to think how near his aspirations were to fulfilment, and yet how certainly, if we assign due weight to those principles which he so often insisted on, and never disavowed, they remain unfulfilled. Dr. Doyle desired a model school for the training of masters, and he was dissatisfied with the University of Dublin. Ireland now possesses model schools in abundance, and three provincial colleges. Neither money nor care has been stinted : why has not the result been peace? Because Dr. Doyle's principles are no longer carried out, as at first, in the National schools (where, in the case of non-vested schools under Protestant patrons and masters, there remains no guarantee that the Catholic

child shall receive Catholic instruction), and because in the provincial colleges his principles were never carried out. What would Dr. Doyle, who insisted on such careful spiritual provision for children, who, except when at school, must have been always under the religious influences of home and neighbourhood, have thought of colleges, under the control of Government, in which, at a far more perilous age, and in the immediate prospect of far greater temptations than those which beset the path of peasants, young men are invited to receive lectures on history and philosophy delivered, possibly, by professors of a religion opposed to their own? What would he have thought of the disruption of family ties, without any provision for such a moral discipline in their place as was provided by the collegiate institutes of old times? If pressed by the scientific claims of the Queen's Colleges, would he not have replied, "This ye should have done, and not left the other undone"? Would he not have asked, "Is it more necessary that model schools should be established without effectual religious control in Ireland, where there are but three important religious denominations, than in England, where the sects are so numerous? Does this diversity recommend itself especially to those persons who insist so strongly upon uniformity of law between the two islands, on matters relating to the tenure of land, when replying to demands grounded expressly on those circumstances notoriously peculiar to the Irish farmer? Is it absolutely necessary that in Ireland a Protestant parent, dissatisfied with the ecclesiastical provisions of the Queen's Colleges, should be able to send his son to the University of Dublin, where he will attend chapel, and enjoy a religious education, and where the highest and governing offices, magnificently maintained out of the spoils of the Catholic Church, are thrown open as objects of his ambition; and yet, that a Catholic parent, dissatisfied with the Queen's Colleges on the same grounds, shall be only able to send his son to the Dublin University in a position of inferiority, and without his there receiving any religious education?"

Sir Thomas Wyse was, in Dr. Doyle's day, the greatest Irish authority on education after that prelate. He too is frequently claimed by the partisans of the present order of things. But his views, as set forth in his celebrated speech at Waterford, subsequently published as a pamphlet, are essentially different from those which Parliament has yet carried out. He recommends, it is true, provincial colleges, and also county academies; but the crown of his educational scheme has no counterpart in that which has been actually estab-

lished It was a great University system, in which Catholics and Protestants were to stand on an exactly equal footing. According to him, either the Dublin University was to be thrown open to Catholics on terms of entire equality, as regards fellowships, &c., or else a special Catholic university was to be *founded, endowed, and chartered* for them by the State,—a university to be governed by a Catholic board, and the religious education of which was to be Catholic. Maynooth may be said to correspond with the *theological faculty* of the Dublin University. Sir Thomas Wyse insisted that the Catholic laity should stand upon an equality with their Protestant fellow-countrymen, not only, as they now do, in his suggested provincial colleges, but likewise in the university system of Ireland. Has his advice been adopted? Alas, we know that the Catholics have at their own expense founded a Catholic university, and that successive governments have refused it even a charter! The exclusive partisans of what, by some, is called “comprehensiveness in education,” and, by others, “promiscuousness and confusion,” will not permit a “clear stage,” even in conjunction with “no favour,” to men whose sole offence is, that they hold principles exactly similar to those professed on collegiate education by the immense majority of their Protestant fellow-subjects, both in England and Ireland! Free trade and frank competition are good things, except where Catholic students claim the benefit of them. In that case alone, the competitors at one side are to be furnished with all the aid the law or the administration can lend them, and their rivals at the other side are to dance in chains. Those who are stigmatised as “exclusive” would be perfectly contented if the Irish people were but allowed to choose for themselves between two systems offered to them on equal terms. They never will be contented with inequality. But let not those enthusiasts of a theory who see danger where none exists, and who see none in thus keeping open wounds of old time,—let them not fight their battle under the shield of Dr. Doyle. A very different class of persons, who had denounced that great prelate all his life on theological grounds, claimed him, when dead, as a convert to Protestantism.*

* The following extract from a letter written by Archbishop Murray throws an interesting light upon the opinions entertained by him, and by two eminent statesmen, Lord Brougham and Lord Melbourne, on the subject of education: “*Entre nous*, Mr. Brougham has been consulted by Mr. Lamb on the education question, and gave it as his opinion, that the more practicable way of educating Catholics and Protestants would be to educate them separately. This I learned in a communication which I had lately with Mr. Lamb

Dr. Doyle, both from character and from his political habits of thought and life, was wisely desirous to conciliate, so far as conciliation involved no surrender of principle. He singularly united the "suaviter in modo" with the "fortiter in re;" a gift restricted to those who possess, not only disinterestedness and sobriety of judgment, but also that keen eye which instinctively discriminates between what is essential and what is accidental. But unworthy compromise and ill-timed conciliation were foreign to his nature. It is thus that he wrote to Mr. George Ensor in 1828 :

"You allude to my not being at the Castle festivities. It is a glorious pastime for Irishmen, when their country is *in extremis*, to sport with the satrap of England, to jostle among gentry with swords and bags on a collar-day ; and how honoured to have the privilege of the *entrée*—that is, to be smuggled as masquers by a back-door into the satrap's presence ! As to Protestants being so captivated I do not wonder ; but that the Catholic Irish can swallow hook, line, and rod, exhibits their deglutition as equal to the far-famed craters ! These things almost make me despair. I used to pray for Ireland, but I have given that up ; for however I might begin, I end with curses, the baseness of man turning me for the instant from the goodness of God. *I have been stung by what you say of your unsuccessful efforts respecting education.*"*

The last sentence is suggestive. It seems to imply that, even before the Irish hierarchy had been proscribed by the Ecclesiastical Titles' Bill, there were subjects by which one of the most large-minded and temperate of the Irish Bishops—one especially a preacher of loyalty—could be moved beyond his wont. We must not quit the subject of education without alluding to the extraordinary care and complete success with which he conducted his own college of Carlow. Mr. Fitz-Patrick tells us :

"Dr. Doyle was fond of contemplating Bishops in embryo. He is known to have specially trained several ecclesiastics at Carlow with a view to the episcopate. Among others may be mentioned the Most Rev. Dr. Cullen, Right Rev. Dr. Nolan, the late Right

on the subject. I told him that though we did not object to the joint education, *we would certainly prefer Mr. Brougham's plan*. I fear, however, that we shall not obtain *so much as that*. He, however, admitted the principle, that the whole of the religious instruction of the children should be placed under the control of their *respective pastors*" (vol. ii. p. 93). These statesmen could not have been surprised at the celebrated Papal Rescript which stated that the National system of 1831 was rather to be accepted than approved in principle, and that in accepting it the utmost limits of justifiable concession on the part of Catholics was reached. The substitution of an imaginary parental authority for a real pastoral one, and the other later changes in the system of 1831, could never have been sanctioned by principles such as they then held.

* Vol. ii. p. 65.

Rev. Dr. Clancy, and the Right Rev. Dr. Walshe. . . . Most of the priests who studied at Carlow during Dr. Doyle's time have attained not a little distinction. Bishop O'Connor informs us that in his presence Dr. Doyle referred to the moral and intellectual gifts of the Rev. Paul Cullen, and prophesied that at a future day he would rise to deserved eminence."*

We can but briefly indicate in passing many topics upon which the reader of these volumes will pause. Such are the philosophical discussion in which Dr. Doyle controverted Locke's theory respecting innate ideas ;† the celebrated national petition for Catholic Emancipation, simultaneously signed in every parish in Ireland on Sunday, the 13th of January 1827, when, by upwards of five millions of people, "aspirations were, at the same hour after the Holy Sacrifice, offered up for liberty of conscience;"‡ the hostile proceedings against the Irish Regulars secretly but unsuccessfully carried on, apparently by more than one government, in the earlier part of this century ;§ Dr. Doyle's letter to the Duke of Wellington, in June 1828, assuring him that, "the Catholic clergy never will partake of any provision of whatsoever description which will render them liable to even a suspicion of being detached from the people;"|| the question of domestic nomination of Bishops, and of an Irish patriarchate ;¶ Dr. Doyle's public letter encouraging O'Connell to undertake the enterprise of the Clare election, and the exclamation of the great tribune on reading it :

"If I had spent twenty-eight centuries, instead of twenty-eight years, in the service of my country, the sentiments expressed in that letter would more than amply reward them. . . . The approbation of Dr. Doyle will bring to our cause the united voice of Ireland. I trust it will be the *vox populi, vox Dei*."**

We must, however, find room for an amusing anecdote, illustrating the mode in which those traditional jealousies to which politicians are subject (even when their legislation on ecclesiastical subjects does not belong to the "fast" school) are sometimes accidentally dispelled. The occurrence took place in 1829, when the very statesmen who were giving liberty to the Catholics yet could hardly shake off a vague impression that their religion was an organised conspiracy. It recalls an idea which must frequently have occurred to many among us, viz. that if the private conversation of the most zealous Catholics chanced but to be overheard by their opponents, nothing could tend more to dissipate causeless alarms, and to bring about a kindly mutual understanding.

"The late Mr. Eneas Mac Donnell was in London at this period, in his capacity of agent to the Catholics of Ireland. He had been in almost daily correspondence with all the Catholic prelates with the exception of Dr. Doyle. Mr. Mac Donnell was sauntering through Spring Gardens with a dozen episcopal letters, which he had just received, in his hand, when he met George Robert Dawson, M.P. for Derry, bustling along to keep a sharp appointment with the Duke of Wellington. Mr. Dawson noticed the pile of letters, and jocosely asked the agent if he would allow him to bring them to the Horse Guards, where the Duke, Mr. Peel, and Lord Chancellor Lyndhurst, were at that moment sitting in solemn conclave. Mr. Mac Donnell promptly acquiesced. 'You do not mean to say,' proceeded Mr. Dawson, 'that I am at liberty to place before the Cabinet your confidential correspondence with the Roman Catholic Bishops!' 'I am perfectly serious,' replied the agent; 'the only stipulation I make is, that you return them to me before noon to-morrow.' George Dawson was punctual next day with the letters. 'You have no conception,' he said, 'of what good these documents have been productive. The Duke was greatly pleased with them. The dates proved that the prelates wrote their respective views without consultation amongst themselves.'"^{*}

To illustrate Dr. Doyle's life adequately is beyond our present limits; we must content ourselves with bringing together some of those traits by which Mr. Fitz-Patrick has illustrated his character. Dr. Doyle reconciled in himself qualities to harmonise which required the peculiar circumstances of time and country under which he lived. He was the characteristic Bishop of Ireland in the earlier part of the 19th century. No continental country could have produced him. He united the pontiff, the statesman, and the patriot. Like Bossuet's, his mind had eminently a political character; but, as the circumstances of his day made the sympathies of the French prelate gravitate towards the despotic monarchy of Louis XIV., so those of Dr. Doyle's time made him chiefly the vindicator of popular rights. But he was not a one-sided man. In ecclesiastical matters, the 19th century had inherited a far richer experience than the 18th. The experiment of the "Gallican Liberties" had been tried; and their meaning had been proved to be—the liberty of the State to enervate and to subdue a Church which it had isolated. In the political sphere, the experiment of lawless liberty had been tried. It had been found to end in tyranny, as tyranny had ended in anarchy. Dr. Doyle revered the British Constitution (so far as it remained unvitiated by sectarian intolerance) because it shunned both of these extremes, each of which is yet more calamitous in its moral and religious than in its

political results. The surly spirit of democratic independence regards all obedience as, at best, a necessary evil, and all government as but a temporary concordat between a subject race and a ruling class. A paternal despotism, on the other hand, undermines the faculties by denying them a sphere for their exercise, and flings men upon epicurean enjoyments by failing to make room for virtue. But a well-ordered liberty at once develops the powers and disciplines the character; while it strengthens religion by leaving it unshackled, and by not affecting to protect it from those trials which are permitted in order to purify it. Such, as far as we can gather, was the basis of Dr. Doyle's political opinions. They are to be collected from many scattered notices in these volumes, and are often expressed with a singular shrewdness of observation, as well as depth of thought. "I know," he says on one occasion, "that the substance of right is very distinct from the *apices juris*, and that a reference to privilege (a thing odious in its nature) is always calculated to beget opposition. Privilege is like a treasure; it ought to be guarded, but never spoken of." He laughed at that pedantry of religious or political theorists which refuses to make allowances for the necessary diversities of race and character. "My dear friends, the French," he writes in 1830, "always had peculiarities in every thing, and have that sort of religion which suits their nation and the notions prevailing with it. It is so with every nation and people under the sun; and our business is to look on, be instructed and amused, but not influenced by any thing but the unchanged spirit of the Gospel." Mr. Fitz-Patrick accounts for the circumstance of a minister having selected Dr. Doyle as a person with whom to consult on the provisions of the sub-letting Act by the remark:

"Lord Melbourne clearly saw that, besides the peculiar advantages Dr. Doyle possessed for gathering accurate knowledge on the operation of local laws, the style both of his spoken evidence and written arguments was that of a great constitutional lawyer. His frequent references to legal maxims and precedents, and the strength and conciseness of his deductions and conclusions, demonstrated his legal acumen and knowledge."*

The same eminently practical character is illustrated by his correspondence with one whom he describes as "a fine, good-natured, witty, holy nun." He warns her against the visionary piety of the Quietists, and admonishes her to rely only on what is solid and plain. "The outward actions ought to be conformable to the rule prescribed by the law

* Vol. ii. p. 268.

of God, and the inward regulated by the Holy Spirit, obtained by prayer, sacraments, &c.”*

One of Dr. Doyle's characteristics was a courage, moral and physical, which had never allowed him, even for a moment, to know fear, and which made his habitual moderation more remarkable. It will be found curiously illustrated at p. 128 (vol. ii.), in a conversation suggested by the Duke of Wellington's duel with Lord Winchelsea. With this habit was perhaps connected his striking originality.

“He had a peculiar faculty—an attribute which belongs only to men of high genius—of stamping an original character on every theological decision he gave; and such was the freshness and vigour with which he illustrated his propositions, that the hearer never once mistook, and never forgot, an opinion which he advanced. . . . He had the singular gift of imparting a defined and practical character to his teaching, of which the Diocesan Statutes, principally the work of his master mind, give us the highest evidence.”† “‘He would put,’ observes a priest, ‘a succession of the most knotty questions to us, involving a most remarkable retentiveness of memory, with his pen running all the time. He could preserve in his mind the two distinct trains of subtle argument at the same moment.’”‡

His memory, indeed, was so perfect, that he hardly ever forgot any thing he had once read. But the variety of his talents was less remarkable than his unity of mind and purpose. No versatility of intellect ever diverted his heart from the two great objects ever present to them—his faith and his native land which he loved with a devotion that combined the affection of a parent and that of a child. Traveling on the Continent, he writes:

“The Netherlands and the north-west of France, the only portions of that happy country which I saw, appear like a well-cultivated garden, teeming with every luxury which the earth in a genial climate can produce. . . . How often, whilst my heart swelled with feelings not to be described, did I turn to Ireland, and ruminate upon her misfortunes! . . . The earth would lie lightly on our remains, could we secure for those who will tread it some portion of that happiness which other nations enjoy.”§

His charity was inexhaustible. We can but add a few more illustrations of it to those we have already given, in describing his conduct during one of the Irish famines. The Marchioness of Tewkesbury had made Dr. Doyle a present of a carriage. The prelate sold it in order to give its proceeds to the cathedral of Carlow, then in course of erection. A visitor calling about this period at his house, mentioned

* Vol. ii. p. 205.

† p. 203.

‡ p. 307.

§ p. 105.

to him the case of a young lady who wished to become a nun, but who could not do so on account of pecuniary distress, brought on by an unexpected lawsuit. On the departure of his guest, the Bishop placed in his hands a letter. On its being opened, there was found within it a 50*l.* note, with the words, "For the young person for whom you are so interested." Giving evidence on one occasion respecting the lack of lunatic asylums in some parts of Ireland, he incidentally mentioned that for years the residence of a poor idiot belonging to Carlow had been the Bishop's house. A profound and unostentatious piety was the root of this charity. A priest, who well knew him, thus describes him :

"While forced by the circumstances of his time to forego the peaceful retirement of the cloister, the spirit of his religious engagement never forsook him : never did he relinquish his early vows, or the fervour of his first devotion. I well know with what pain he mingled in the distractions of the world. Solitude was his delight to the last ; and prayer and thought filled up whatever short intervals of leisure he enjoyed. Every day he read the Holy Scriptures on his knees, and there, and at the foot of the Cross, he imbibed the lofty zeal that animated all his acts, and the tender unction which flows through his imperishable writings."*

There were occasions on which his piety and his patriotism seemed one. Visiting the Sienna Convent at Drogheda, he was there shown its precious relic, the head of Archbishop Plunket, the last victim to the "Popish Plot," who was tortured to death in 1681, and whose life has recently been so ably written by Dr. Moran. Unable to suppress his emotions, the strong man, who seemed made for battling with adverse polemics, and instructing parliamentary committees, threw himself on his knees to venerate the relic. He felt sure that if Oliver Plunket had not yet been canonised, the great martyr-prelate of the 17th century deserved canonisation.

The political influence which Dr. Doyle acquired without seeking it, and used but on important occasions, indicates the amount of power he might have wielded had he been an ambitious man. Authoritative he probably was, as most men strongly endowed with the governing faculty are ; and, no doubt, a wide sphere for the exercise of his large faculties was agreeable to him ; but from the uneasy egotism of vanity he was wholly free. He put forth his strength only when the shortcomings of others demanded it. He considered that the first Whig ministry after the carrying of Catholic Emancipation treated Ireland with injustice, nay, that in some of their appointments, they were guilty of what sometimes has

* Vol. ii. p. 50.

as lasting effects in the political as in the social world—bad manners. On this subject a singularly interesting correspondence will be found, between him and an English nobleman, whose name is not given, which throws much light on that time. Dr. Doyle's tone is that of a man who has been disappointed in statesmen, to whom he is, notwithstanding, still willing to give a fair trial, but whose reforming tendencies, he thinks, require a considerable stimulus from the expression of Irish public opinion. He refused at this period to pledge himself either in favour of or against Repeal, but urged upon the attention of the Government many measures, of which, before long, they introduced several, though sometimes unsuccessfully, as in the case of the Appropriation Clause.

In the election of 1831, the Orange party was for the first time defeated in Dublin. In the county of Carlow two Liberals were returned to Parliament by Dr. Doyle's influence. It was on this occasion that Mr. Sheil wrote, "Who could have conjectured that a Bachelor of Coimbra, and afterwards a priest in some part of Wexford, and then a Professor of Dogmatic Divinity at the Sacerdotal College of Carlow, should now, with a mitre as lofty as that of Becket (although without a gem in it) on his brow, and a pastoral staff of Bellarmine potency in his hand, legislate for the passions of the people, and not only summon and dismiss at his bidding the popular emotions, but, without a stretch or effort, and by the simple intimation of his will, accomplish that which not a peer in the empire could have effected?" Yet such an exercise of power was with him a wholly disinterested act. Agitation was not his element; and favours, when offered to him, he steadily rejected: as Mr. Fitz-Patrick tells us, he agreed with the Roman emperor who said, "The priest of the gods, if he sometimes visits the palace, should appear there only as the advocate of those who have vainly solicited either justice or mercy. . . . Rank had no charms for him; and that little with which the affection of a grateful flock loves to invest their prelates in moments of salutation, he utterly disliked, and often charged his friends to abstain from using towards him. To be called 'Father' was his utmost ambition." Those who fancy that the celibacy of the clergy must prevent them from sympathising with the domestic relations, will not find their theory confirmed by the following incident. The Bishop was walking with a friend among some wretched hovels in the neighbourhood of Carlow. As some labourers were returning from their work, a number of children, catching sight of them,

rushed out with loud acclamations to meet their parents, who snatched them up in their arms. "Do you not think, my lord," said the Bishop's companion, "that men so poor as these are great fools to marry, and encumber themselves with families?" "Indeed I do not," was the Bishop's reply; "that happiness you would deprive them of is their only comfort. Why should we grudge them to forget for a moment their wretchedness?" In latter times, at least, the frequently-quoted text about "forbidding to marry" would seem oftener applicable to political philosophers than churchmen.

In our desire to bring out the chief traits of Dr. Doyle's character, or the more important lessons to be learned from his career, we have been obliged to leave unnoticed much to which we should have been glad to direct the reader's attention. We must hurry to the close. The decline in Dr. Doyle's health seems to have commenced almost immediately after Catholic Emancipation; and though he fought many a battle after that period, it was with efforts more painful to him as his strength gave way. Doubtless the end might have been deferred, had he obeyed the injunctions of his physicians, and abated his toils; but again and again there was something to be done which no one else could do so well; and the needful journey was postponed, or the needful relaxation brought to an early close. The labours of his diocese were enormous. Among his toils, none tried him more than those so frequently required to keep down Ribbon conspiracies. They were not always successful. On one occasion, propping his failing body with his crosier, as he addressed, on a hill-side, some of those whom his remonstrances and denunciations had hitherto failed to touch, he exclaimed, "Oh, my people! you have broken your Bishop's heart!" On another, he said, "Men of the Queen's County, my blood is upon you." He conducted the retreats of his clergy himself,—first those of the coadjutors, and then those of the parish-priests, preaching on some occasions four times a day, with a power which has been described as awful. He wrote more polemical works, and at least one political treatise on a very grave subject, which has never yet been published, carrying on at the same time a correspondence in Ireland, England, and the Continent, such as alone would have overtaken the energies of most men. But at last he felt that the time of his warfare was drawing to a close. It found him still contemplating new labours.

"'I spent,' writes the parish-priest of Ballinakill, 'some weeks

with Dr. Doyle at Tramore, the autumn previous to his death. He frequently expressed a regret that he had not been spared to accomplish a work which then engaged his mind, and on which he seemed to have set his heart, viz. the elaboration of treatises on laws, justice, and contracts. . . . I remember one day, when sitting on a rock overhanging the sea, his giving me an outline of the manner in which he intended to treat the subject of Law.’ ”

As the time for his departure drew nearer, his willingness to take his rest increased. Writing to a nun in May 1834, he said :

“ ‘This is the last time I will attempt to disturb your peace by placing before you that image of coming dissolution which so strongly affects you. . . . The objects for which I seem to have been sent into the world are, in a great degree, attained ; and as the mercy of God is above all His works, and as He hates nothing of what He has made, may we not hope that He is chastising my offences before He calls me to judgment, — a judgment which no man can stand ? ’ ”

He became at last too weak to open his own letters.

“The Vicar-General opened all Dr. Doyle’s letters for several weeks before his death. ‘Well, what letters to-day ?’ he would ask. ‘Six, my lord : one from the Secretary of State, soliciting your opinion on his new Bill ; another from Sydney Smith, declaring that the public expression of your opinion on Church property at this crisis would be hailed as a boon by the British Dissenters, as well as the Irish Roman Catholics ; a third from Father —, begging of you to give him faculties ; a fourth from a parson, arguing a point of theology with you ; and two from evangelical ladies, urging you to embrace the truths of Protestantism.’ ”

We can but select a few out of the many touching circumstances with which Mr. Fitz-Patrick has skilfully illustrated the closing scenes of this memorable life.

“About six weeks before the death of Dr. Doyle, a priest visited him ; it was late in the evening, and the sun was just setting in a cloudless May sky. The Bishop was alone, and was very much exhausted. . . . He continually complained of a feeling of suffocation, and he had often been removed from room to room, looking for relief from this overwhelming sensation. On this occasion he was carried to the library window ; and thus situated, he pensively fixed his eyes, as nearly as the position of the house would permit, on the darkening shades of the west. Although he was aware that the priest (an intimate visitor) had entered the room, having heard his name announced by the servant, he still kept his large hazel eyes riveted on the same view, and remained for a considerable time silent and motionless as a statue. Then, awakening as it were from a reverie, and turning round with a sad smile, ‘Alas,’ he said, ‘how indifferent are men to the glorious lessons which our good God every

day, every hour, every minute, places before us in every object that surrounds us ! What signify the ideas of men on paper, or in conversation, in comparison with the facts displayed before us in the wonderful works of nature ! Oh, such power, such wisdom, such order, and such providence ! and, in their silent exhibition, such eloquence, such persuasion ! ”*

His will was a brief one : it consisted but of two lines.

“ ‘ All things that I possess came to me from the Church, and to the Church and the poor let them return, all. ’ The present Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin was by the bedside of Dr. Doyle the whole of the last night. At three o’clock, just as the gray dawn was breaking, Dr. Doyle requested to be carried from his bed, and placed opposite an open window. In this position he slightly revived. The fresh air of morning was laden with fragrance ; the song of the blackbird mingled with the harsher tones of the cornrake. The Bishop’s eyes rested on the rich country, smiling in the luxuriance of June. To the last his mind was as clear and collected as possible. Having detailed to the good priest who supported his knees several directions which he wished to have carried out, Dr. Doyle gave his thoughts entirely up to God, and indulged in a prolonged series of ejaculatory prayers. He made his confession to the late Dr. Nolan. . . . Humble and mortified to the last, he could not endure the utterance of a word that reminded him of any good he had done ; to God alone he gave all the merit ; on God alone were all his ideas fixed. When exhausted nature apprised him that the last sad struggle was approaching, he called for the Viaticum. . . . The Bishop having said, ‘ Take this body of flesh, and fling it on the floor, ’ his attendants gathered up the four corners of the sheet, and placed their burden upon the ground. Dr. Doyle several times endeavoured to raise his long bony arms in order to join his fingers in an attitude of prayer ; but they as often fell from sheer debility. At last the Rev. James Maher presented the Holy Viaticum. ‘ The sublimity and joy of the Bishop’s prayer, ’ says Mr. Maher, ‘ while I repeated the words, *Ecce Agnus Dei*, baffles all description. It seemed to me as if the dying prelate saw a vision of Christ standing meekly and lovingly before him, and that he was fired with an ardour to become instantly dissolved. ’ ”†

Thus died the great Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, on Sunday morning, the 15th of June 1834, in the forty-eighth year of his age, and the fifteenth of his episcopate. During his agony, the Sacrifice of the Mass was offered for him in his private chapel, the cathedral, and the college. For several days afterwards, nearly all the shops in Carlow, Protestant as well as Catholic, remained closed. The cathedral, college, and convent bells tolled throughout the week. On Monday, permission was given to the public to view the

remains as they lay in state, dressed with the mitre, rochet, cross, and crosier. During two nights, the students of the college kept watch over the body. The Archbishops of Dublin and Cashel, with several of their suffragan Bishops, assisted at the solemn obsequies. At the funeral, the people insisted on removing the horses and drawing the hearse themselves ; while 20,000 persons attended the procession. Amid the tears and prayers of his people, the lowly Augustinian novice, the ardent student of Coimbra, the pontiff, the patriot, and the statesman, was laid in rest, opposite to the altar of the cathedral he had built. "*Ecce Sacerdos magnus, qui in diebus suis placuit Domino. Non est inventus similis illi, qui conservaret legem Excelsi.*"

Communicated Article.

DR. MANNING ON THE PAPAL SOVEREIGNTY.*

THERE is much food for meditation in Dr. Manning's three lectures. There are cogent proofs of the necessity of affirming some kind of Papal sovereignty ; but there are also obscurities of conception and expression which tend to confuse the substance with the accidents of that sovereignty, by raising its external and temporal trappings to the same level as the internal and everlasting truth which lies hid under them.

The lectures begin with a useful distinction :

"The temporal power of the Pope contains in itself two distinct elements. The first is, the sovereignty inherent in his own person ; and the second is, the local sovereignty over the State which he holds. These are two distinct things. His own personal sovereignty consists in this : first, that as the Vicar and representative of Jesus Christ, who is King of kings and Lord of lords, he is liberated by Divine right from all civil and temporal subjection to any ruler or prince on earth. Thus he is in himself a personal sovereign, and can be subject to none ; and thus also he has, in virtue of his pontificate, a divine authority over all other powers, personal or princely, that can be found among men ; forasmuch as when our Divine Lord said to Peter, 'Feed My sheep,' He gave the whole world into his hands ; He committed to him not only the direction of individuals one by one, but the direction of families, of households, of all the collective forms of natural society."

* The Last Glories of the Holy See greater than the First. Three Lectures. By H. E. Manning, D.D. Burns and Lambert.

This statement is not sufficiently guarded. The freedom of the Pope by divine right from all civil and temporal subjection must be so interpreted as to save St. Gregory the Great from the imputation of a breach of his trust, when, to use his own words, "he fulfilled his duty in yielding obedience to the emperor, and publishing his order" (forbidding any man fit for service in the wars to enter a monastery), though as Pope he denounced the law as unjust, and warned the Emperor Maurice of the judgment to come. It must be so interpreted as to vindicate the Popes who, for more than a thousand years, all more or less reckoned themselves to owe temporal allegiance to the emperors, whether Greeks, Franks, or Germans, and who, after the empire became Christian, generally sought the confirmation of their election from the emperor. So, again, their sovereignty over all Christians must not only be limited by the meaning of the terms in which it was conveyed,—*"feed My sheep,"* that is, *"feed as pastor,"* not *"govern as Cæsar;"* *"direct in all matters of faith and morals,"* not *"command in all the relations of temporal sovereignty,"*—but it must also be interpreted by the rule, *"render to Cæsar what is Cæsar's,"* and by several declarations of Popes, such as that of St. Gelasius, who says, that whereas in pagan states the spiritual and temporal powers were gathered into one hand, "Christ, in pity to our frailty, tempered the means of our salvation in a glorious dispensation, and separated the spheres of the two powers, giving to each its proper action and its distinct dignity; . . . so that emperors stand in need of Popes for matters of eternal life, and Popes make use of the government of emperors for the course of temporal affairs, so that the sphere of spiritual action might be quite separate from mundane matters, and that the soldier of God should not entangle himself with secular affairs, nor, on the other hand, that the man who was engaged in secular business should make show of presiding over divine matters, so that the modesty of each order might be provided for;"—of Pope Symmachus, who writes to the Emperor Anastasius, that "while the emperor administers human affairs, the Pope dispenses divine things, so that he has, I will not say superior, but equal honour;"—and of Gregory II. to Leo the Isaurian: "As the Pope has no right of inspection in the palace, nor of conferring royal dignities, so neither has the emperor right of inspection in the Church." God and Cæsar can coexist, and so can Pope and Cæsar, each independent in his own sphere, each with his own rights and with his own duties.

But it is also true that all persons and corporations, and

most of their acts, have a double relation ; one to God, and one to the world ; one to eternity, and one to time. The Christian law demands that in its eternal relation every person, every corporation, every human act, should be free of Cæsar, and subject only to God, or to the authorised organ of His revelation and exponent of His will. Further, the Christian law imposes such freedom as a duty on the conscience, and commands us, in the conflict of human and divine law, to obey God only, and to condemn Cæsar. Hence the Church and each of her members has certain rights against all the world : the right to hold and to do that which Christ commands us to hold and to do, and the right to preach, declare, and teach all that the Church is commissioned to preach, declare, and teach. And this in spite of, and notwithstanding all opposition on the part of, the powers of the world.

In one sense, then, every Christian is a personal sovereign, just as the wise man with the Stoics was a king because he had his passions in command, and, whatever happened to his body, his soul was free. For the subjection of the Christian to earthly powers ceases when their laws begin to contradict the laws of God.

Further, the persons who, by God's law, have any responsibility for, or authority over, others, ought to be free from subjection to temporal rulers in proportion to, and within the legitimate limits of, this responsibility or authority. The civil code has no right to interfere between the parent and child within the limits of reasonable obedience. The father possesses not only the personal sovereignty of his own independence and freedom, but the further sovereignty of parental authority over his child. The priest also is personal sovereign in these two senses. For he is not only lord of his own conscience, as against the encroachments of Cæsar, but he is also divinely charged with the care of the consciences of his flock, and therefore must be free to perform this function in the teeth of any mere earthly sovereign. It would be intolerable that the rightful director of consciences, in matters where they are free from the control of Cæsar, should, in giving this direction, be himself subject to Cæsar.

And the sphere of this second element of personal sovereignty, the right of direction, increases as we ascend higher in the pastoral scale. It is greater for the rector of a parish than for the chaplain of a family ; greater for the Bishop than for the rector ; greatest of all for the Pastor of pastors, the successor of St. Peter, who feeds the whole of the flock of Christ.

But, however large in sphere, is the personal sovereignty

of the Pope essentially different from the personal sovereignty of every Christian, of every parent, of every priest? Does it differ in kind, or only in intensity and extensiveness? And if it does not differ in kind, need the guarantees with which it is guarded differ in kind from the guarantees by which the personal sovereignty of every Christian is guarded? As a matter of history and experience, I suppose that at first, in the days of persecution, there was but one guarantee for the confession of the lay Christian, and the "liberty of prophesying" of the priest,—the guarantee of martyrdom. Each was able, and each was bound, to lay down his life for the freedom of belief, the freedom of confession, and the freedom of preaching, in the teeth of a hostile state or a persecuting Cæsar. In those days the personal sovereignty of layman, priest, bishop, or Pope, had but one and the same guarantee. As society went through its historical changes, the guarantees also changed; but they changed equally for all. The personal sovereignty of Bishops, abbots, and priests in the provinces was found to require the same guarantees as the personal sovereignty of the Popes at Rome; all obtained, in their measure and degree, the same immunities and similar temporal possessions and powers, and the Prince-Bishop of Rome was only the chief of a large hierarchy of similar ecclesiastical sovereigns elsewhere. Whatever temporal guarantees Christians found useful to protect their freedom were naturally adopted at Rome, and conversely, whatever the Pope found useful for that purpose was, as far as might be, adopted elsewhere; Christendom thus became a homogeneous organised whole, full of vitality, naturally changing its outward shape as the world changed, and, under St. Gregory VII., utilising the feudal system as easily as it had utilised that of Charlemagne.

But if this is a general law, why is the temporal condition of the Pope now so different from that of Bishops? Are we to conclude that the present state is only one of transition? And if so, whose state is to be altered? Is the temporal condition of the Pope likely to be lowered to that of Bishops, or that of Bishops elevated to the condition which the Pope held a few years ago, and still nominally enjoys? The eye of the politician will not detect many signs of such a restoration of ecclesiastical power in all lands as the latter alternative implies. Is the condition of the Pope, then, to be lowered? The Bishops of Western Europe have almost unanimously declared that it cannot be,—that, "the imperishable vitality and invincible tenacity of the Pope as temporal sovereign will ever be more and more luminously manifested to the world."

But this declaration is not about things which are, but things which are to come. It is not a definition of what is, but an attempt to prophesy what shall be. Now what are such anticipations worth? Was there ever a man to whom it was given, while watching the gradual fall of any great political or religious system, to divine or to guess what was to succeed it? On the approach of great catastrophes, prognostications of destruction and chaos have always been rife; but who ever anticipated what new kosmos was to be fashioned from the chaos, what new edifice was to rise on the ruins of the old? The voice of the prophet was ever a wail over the past and passing, rather than a song of hope for the future. Yet, in spite of anticipations of evil, better orders have for the most part taken the place of those which have vanished, and society on the whole has progressed in morality, civilisation, and individual liberty. After the crash of idolatry, the Christian Church was found seated in the old temples; slavery passed away, and our Christian domestic life took its place; but no philosopher divined the change. Nor have Christians been better seers; though they had the prophecies of Scripture to guide them, yet they knew not how to interpret these predictions; it was not given to them to know the times and seasons which God had kept in His own power. Divine providence has always led the Church into safe and fertile pastures, but not always by the way which her children anticipated. The early Popes dreaded the temporal business and rule which was being forced upon them, and they looked at their new earthly dignities as the instrument, not of their independence, but of their servitude; and therefore, as Mgr. Dupanloup says, "so far from wishing to transform themselves into temporal princes, they deplored bitterly and unceasingly this inevitable transformation; their authority imposed itself upon them against their will." The Popes, then, as popes, have no power of deciphering the future; and though the inquirer will own that it is still the duty of good men to fight for the present order of things, because it is the only order they know of, yet a seeming defeat will never make him despair, for he knows that in the darkness of the future are hidden the germs of an unimagined triumph.

The anticipations of the faithful are no surer guide to a knowledge of the future than to the truths of geology or astronomy. In spite of them, it is not unlikely that the Popes may be once more brought to the same position as other Bishops; for it is unlikely that a system which makes the Papal power unlike every other, which annuls all the steps that once led up to it, all the gradually-widening circles of

similar immunities that once protected it, and which leaves it an anomaly among states, can have the elements of stability. So far as the Pope's personal sovereignty resembles that of other Bishops, of priests, or of Christian laymen, it would probably be best secured by the same means which are found by experience to be the best guarantees of the liberty of the clergy and laity in other lands. Now if we ask where the clergy are least harassed and interfered with in their dealings both with the Pope and their flocks, and under what law and constitution they find the greatest security, we must reply, in England and her colonies, and in the United States, under the laws and constitution of those countries where government does not wish to meddle with our affairs, and where, in spite of some remnants of an old persecuting code, legislators are more or less honestly developing the principle of freedom of religion, by abstaining from all interference, and by leaving the way clear for the legitimate exercise of the personal sovereignty of every Christian. In such countries, doubtless, "a free church in a free state" is theoretically the best guarantee for the personal sovereignty of Pope, Bishop, priest, or layman. But it will not thence follow that it is the best guarantee in Italy, or that Cavour and his disciples are honest in promising it. Indeed, they have discredited their professions by their arbitrary, illegal, and violent method of dealing with the Bishops and clergy, and they have shown that liberty is only meant for those who agree with them, not for those who oppose them. Their deeds have belied their words. A free church in a free state can only replace the temporal sovereignty as the guarantee of Papal independence, when the state can sufficiently secure the freedom of the church both against the administration and against the people. In England, the church is secure enough against the oppression and encroachment of government, but not against a No-popery riot, which might set all rights at defiance in the streets. A free church in a free state, practically, requires English law, and a Catholic population, a combination that may be found in the south of Ireland. It may be true that this theory points in the direction which events are taking; but it does not seem practicable in Italy, governed by Piedmontese administrators under the Cavourian *statuto*. The theory may be perfect, but not fit for these times. Belarmino, like St. Bernard, thought the Pope would be better without temporal power, but he judged it to be necessary. *propter malitiam temporum*: he could devise no other means to secure independence; but he did not forget that it was only a means, not an end. In fact, what the Pope wants is,

not a positive right of governing, but a negative right of not being governed ; not a centre of political power, but a basis of independence. Hence the extent of this sovereignty is not essential ; but it is difficult to see how, even in the most ideally free society, unless the nations were all fused into one great confederation or empire, the Pope could do without some such sovereignty : he will always differ from other Bishops in this, that whereas they belong to particular nations, the Pope belongs to all. Episcopacy is national, the Papacy is international ; hence the national securities that are enough for a Bishop may not be enough for a Pope. For instance, how would the free church in a free state secure the freedom of Papal intercourse with the Catholics of a country at war with Italy ? But perhaps it is idle to suppose that any guarantee can be perfect. It is plain that the temporal sovereignty, such as it has hitherto existed, was never more than a very partial and meagre security of Papal independence. There are quite as many theoretical objections to it as to the free church in a free state.

“The local sovereignty,” says Dr. Manning, “is over that state, territory, and people which the Providence of God has committed to the Vicar of Jesus Christ. No one can read its history without perceiving that it was given by the same Divine will and the same Divine hand from which he received also his personal sovereignty in the beginning, and was liberated from all subjection.” I do not quite understand whether Dr. Manning means that this local sovereignty exists by the same *divine right* as the personal sovereignty ; he declares in this passage that the personal sovereignty existed “in the beginning,” that it was as perfect in the martyr-popes in the Catacombs as in the Sovereign Pontiffs in the Vatican,—as real in St. Gregory the Great, who acknowledged himself the subject of the Emperor Maurice, as in St. Gregory VII., who asked all the monarchs of Europe to acknowledge themselves his vassals. The personal sovereignty of the Popes, then, is an immutable element, existing from the beginning ; but the local sovereignty has gradually accrued, has grown up from nothing, and has been subject to many vicissitudes in all ages since it began. I do not see, then, how the two sovereignties can be compared. One is the body, the other the raiment ; one the substance, the other the accident ; one unchanging, or only once or twice betrayed by such weakness as that of Liberius, the other only a thousand years old at the most, and perpetually subject to interruption and variation. Yet I can hardly suppose that Dr. Manning only means that, since whatever authority exists upon earth is from God, therefore the

local sovereignty of the Pope is from God; and that, as God is one, this local sovereignty exists by the same Will and Hand as that which established the personal sovereignty and independence of the Supreme Pastor. The principle is so true that it is a truism; it is so universal that its application to a given case confers no peculiarity on that case. And the history of the changes through which the local sovereignty has passed, till it has reached its present state (whether of progress or of dissolution, who knows?), is a strange substructure for the argument that this variable is henceforth to be invariable, this accident henceforth to be substance, this temporary to be eternal. Dr. Manning's logic is so remarkable as almost to defy analysis. He divides the Papal sovereignty into its two elements, the personal and the local; the first original, and unchangeable from the beginning, the second wanting in early times, then gradually accumulating round the personal sovereignty, and through rough vicissitudes growing to the form it assumed in the sixteenth century. And therefore "this order livinely founded, divinely unfolded, and divinely sustained," in Dr. Manning's belief, can never be dissolved. Does he, then, believe that whatever God founds, unfolds, and sustains can never be dissolved? That in this mutable world He is bound to do always what He does once? By the same rule, He would have been bound to make Judaism eternal, to keep the Church perpetually in the state of martyrdom, or to stereotype her in the form into which St. Gregory VII. fashioned her. But it is absurd to conclude that because past changes have been very wonderful and very providential, therefore there will never be any future change at all. If Dr. Manning was contented that this prophetic anticipation should not pass for more than it is, namely, a private belief of his own, no one would have any right to blame him. But it will appear in the sequel that he goes much beyond this.

The personal sovereignty of the Pope may exist though the Pope has no local sovereignty, as it did in Nero's days, and its existence is not imperilled by being recognised by the sovereign of Rome, as it was under Constantine and Charlemagne. For after Charlemagne had given a kind of regal state to the Pope, the Roman people still took the oath of allegiance to the emperor. Now what kind of prince can we call him whose subjects swear allegiance to another monarch? When Louis le Débonnaire ceded certain territories to the Pope, he expressly and stringently reserved them under the imperial supremacy by the very charter which confirmed them. What kind of sovereignty was the Pope's local sovereignty over these? The same charter expressly recognises

the perfect independence of the Pope, and thus apparently sets up cross jurisdictions. But the distinction between the Pope's personal sovereignty and his local rule, between his ecclesiastical supremacy and his political subordination, will explain the apparent confusion.

The Constitution of Charlemagne is that to which Montalembert appeals; and the Roman liturgy still embalms the memory of this golden age. Now Leo III., who restored the empire in Charlemagne, did not withdraw Rome from the empire, but made it the pivot of its power; the Cæsar was Emperor of the Romans: all that Leo did was, as Innocent III. said of him, to transfer the Roman empire from the Greeks to the Franks. He changed the dynasty; he did not suppress or alter the rights of the emperor. The Romans prayed for their emperor in their liturgy; and afterwards none of the Popes who most distinctly claimed either a feudal suzerainty or a civil supremacy by divine right over all Christian princes, ever went on to alter these liturgical forms.* We may still read in the Roman Missal the prayers for "our emperor," and for "the holy Roman empire," though they were apparently made void of meaning by the abolition of that empire in 1806. But then the Popes have not recognised that abolition; for on the failure of the Congress of Vienna to restore it in 1815, Cardinal Consalvi wrote a letter and protest, June 14, 1815, and Pope Pius VII. made an allocution to the same effect September 4th in the same year.

The truth is, that the importance of the Roman empire to the Church is one of the ancient traditions of Christendom. Our Lord's promise to St. Peter is held to secure the permanence of his power and sovereignty to his successors in his chair at Rome; but also the power which hinders the advent of Antichrist to destroy that chair is, by a tradition, almost as universally held to be the Roman empire. The Church, then, has been as anxious as the sovereigns of Europe that the empire should never really be dissolved, but should always be upheld by one or another representative of Augustus. And Sir Francis Palgrave speaks like a Christian doctor when he calls the political and moral unity of the ancient empire of the Cæsars of Rome, and of the medieval holy Roman empire, "the great truth upon which the whole history of European society, and more than European society, European

* I am speaking of the prayers for the emperor. A remarkable change has been made in the Collect for the Office of St. Peter's Chair. It once stood, "Deus qui beato Petro collatis clavibus regni cœlestis, *animas* ligandi atque solvendi pontificium tradidisti," &c. But since the time of Gregory XIII. the word *animas* has been omitted in Missals and Breviaries.

civilisation, depends." The Church and the world are equally interested that the Roman empire should still be considered living, and the nature of this interest is exemplified by the protection which the Pope even now enjoys under the wings of the eagles which claim to represent the ancient standards of the Roman legions.* But if the Church proclaims that the Roman empire still lives, she virtually proclaims the authority *de facto* or *de jure* of the emperor over the population of Rome. The authority may be dormant, but it clearly cannot be maintained without its being subject to the contingency of a periodical revival at the expense of the local sovereignty of the Pope.

And it seems to me that this is treated in the canon law as the normal condition of the relation between Pope and emperor. That law is based upon the supposition that an emperor of the Romans exists, and that he is the political head of Italy. Look at the decree of Leo III., in Gratian, canon, *tibi Domine*, xxxiii. dis. 63, and at that of Innocent III., in the decretals of Gregory IX., cap. 4. There are passages of Clement V. and of St. Antoninus to the same effect, besides the allocution of Pius VII., to which I have already referred. A sign of the oblivion which now obscures the principles of canon law may be found in the popularity of a novel title of the Pope, *il Papa-Re*. It is not only Garibaldi and About who invidiously give him this name, but also the donors of Peter's pence, whose gifts are advertised in the *Armonia*. Yet this title is not only unknown to canon law, but completely opposed to its spirit. Pope St. Gelasius formally repudiated the title of king, and Gratian, Dec. p. 1. dis. 2, can. 1, cites authorities who pronounce it to be incongruous and false. Cardinal Peter d'Ailly wrote a treatise against it.

If the question of the Pope's local sovereignty was considered merely in a political aspect, or on the side of natural right and justice, this appeal to old laws would be mere antiquarian trifling. But if the local sovereignty is made a question of faith, then antiquities become at once part of the evidence. The faith is substantially unchangeable; whatever is believed now was implicitly believed in the first ages; the seed was there from which, and not from a foreign graft, the plant has grown. The ecclesiastical dicta of former ages need not explicitly contain all that is now of faith; but I suppose that they cannot contain the explicit contradiction of any thing that is now, or ever will be, matter of formal dogma. Old canons, therefore, however forgotten, are not altogether

* Cardinal Pacca thought that the revival of the empire by Napoleon I. might render the temporal power altogether unnecessary.

obliterated ; they may be no longer laws to be obeyed, but they will always be sufficient proof that what they impugn cannot be made matter of faith, or assumed to be part of the tradition handed down from the beginning *semper, ubique et ab omnibus*.

It was thus that the late Cardinal Lewicki, Archbishop of Lemberg, in his pastoral of March 10, 1841, quoted with marvellous effect from the old Slavonic liturgies statements about the Popes which the unhappy Ruthenians were being tortured into denying. The Russian Church was put to shame for persecuting opinions which it once held, and still praised. So our old books countenance the opinion that the Pope is not king by divine right, and may owe allegiance to the emperor without damage to his personal sovereignty. Therefore such an opinion must be at least consistent with faith.

But Dr. Manning hardly allows this. "Now," he says, "the law of the temporal sovereignty has become a law of the conscience, an axiom of the reason. Like the great dogmas of the Church, through controversy it has reached its analysis and expression. It stands by the side of the Immaculate Conception, a theological certainty, if not a definition. . . . From the whole episcopate of the Church has come one universal acclamation of faith in the temporal sovereignty of the Vicar of Jesus Christ as a divine institution upon earth. The consent of the pastors and their flocks witnesses to this deep Catholic instinct, and the voice of the episcopate raises it to a judgment of the Church, and furnishes the material for a more solemn utterance." Surely, in so important a matter, Dr. Manning should have more explicitly told us whether it is the personal sovereignty alone, or the local sovereignty alone, or the compound of the two, and if the last, in which of its numerous phases, that, as a doctrine and law of the conscience, is a counterpart to the Immaculate Conception, a theological certainty, if not a definition, and a judgment of the Church. The definition should be very precisely given, in order that we might know who are good Catholics and who bad, who orthodox and who heterodox. To leave the matter undefined, is to set a snare for the conscience. It is not for a moment to be supposed that Dr. Manning purposely abstained from making his meaning clear in order to make his readers think he meant more than he really intended, and to terrify them with obscurity and mystery. Yet there may be persons whom Dr. Manning will make afraid that, in order to be good Catholics, they must believe something which in fact they need not, and which they

cannot bring themselves to believe. These immediately suppose themselves bad Catholics; then they lose their fervour, and soon become what they suppose themselves. If this view of Dr. Manning's were matter of faith, most Catholics would be heretics, for few believe it as of faith. This ought to be the *reductio ad absurdum* of his whole argument. It is intolerable to brand people with a bad name, which tends to make them what it expresses; for they who are called bad Catholics unquestionably are in much danger of becoming so. There is no scandal more mischievous than this, none which good men should be more careful to eschew. When even Dr. Manning places such stones in his brethren's path, what will reckless and imprudent disputants do? He may be convinced that he ought to believe that God has fused the personal and local sovereignties into an indiscerptible whole, never to be divided; but who authorised him to imply that all who do not agree with him err from the faith? May I be permitted to express a doubt whether he agrees with himself? I do not think he would go so far as to refuse absolution to a penitent, otherwise orthodox, who only persisted in denying the necessity of the Pope's local sovereignty.

I have shown that before the Pope's right to a perfectly independent local sovereignty is made an article of faith, there are canons to be scratched out, Papal rescripts to be amended, and liturgies to be revised. Can this be done? I know that there were some similar difficulties in the way of the definition of the present beatific vision of the Saints by the Council of Constance, but I doubt whether the difficulties were equal. Besides, that was a question about invisible things, matters of pure faith and revelation; the temporal sovereignty of the Pope, on the contrary, is a visible fact in the natural order, like the sovereignty of other princes, and placed by the Holy Father himself upon nearly the same footing as that of Francis II. over Naples. It is equally unlike the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, which is also an invisible fact in the supernatural order. And there is no real similarity in the way in which the two doctrines have been promulgated: about the Immaculate Conception there was a true "consent of pastors with their flocks;" about the temporal sovereignty I do not think that any such consent has been shown to exist. Now I speak under correction; but is it not necessary, do not the Papal decrees require, that the laity*

* Pope Nicholas I. to the Emperor Michael, in 865, see Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, p. 112, nos. 265, &c.: "Where have you read that your imperial predecessors sat in synods? Except, perhaps, in those where they treated of faith, which is universal, which is all men's in common, which belongs not only to the clergy, but to the laity as well, and universally to all Christians."

should be taken account of as well as the clergy in defining matters of faith?

My readers will see that I am not arguing against the Pope's local sovereignty, but against its being assumed to be an article of faith, or on the point of becoming so. The fact itself may be one for which it is glorious to make every personal sacrifice, even to loss of life; yet for all this it is a question, not of faith, but of ecclesiastical politics, of prudence and foresight, in which good men may take opposite sides without a slur upon their orthodoxy. The controversy is not one of faith, of interpretations of Scripture, and of prophecy, but of history and political prudence. Is the local sovereignty such a guarantee as it is assumed to be? Is it real when the Pope can only exercise it under the protection of foreigners? Is he not dependent on those who alone secure his independence of his own subjects? Hundreds of such questions may be asked without any heretical bias.

I am aware that in the theologians of the Middle Ages will be found a view similar to Dr. Manning's: Boniface VIII. proclaimed the divine right of the temporal sovereignty of the Pope over all earthly crowns. Yet, not only was his theory never realised, but the attempt to carry it out was the cause of the decline of the Papal power in Europe which began after his reign. If it failed in those days, when the clergy were still supreme in knowledge, and when they had the power which immense possessions gave them, how much more now! The theory grew naturally from the aspirations which the possibilities of the time suggested; and it seems only to deserve consideration when viewed, in the light of that age, as a question of history. As a doctrine claiming our respect it is confronted with another theory, defined with equal distinctness and by equal authorities; and as this other theory is the only one that has stood the test of events and the light of day, there is certainly no presumption of religiousness in favour of the view taken by Dr. Manning. This theory ruined the Popes once, and drove them into captivity; what will it do now? Even if it were true speculatively,—and I deny that it is so, but I suppose it for argument's sake,—is this the time to put it forward? is this the age to be called “the period of the temporal sovereignty,” seeing the effect its assertion must have on Protestants, and on the vast majority of Catholics, especially Catholic scholars, who deny it?*

* I was surprised to see in a recent volume of the *Analecta Juris Pontificii* a republication and reassertion of the thesis of a Polish professor of the seventeenth century, which claimed in the strongest terms for the Pope by divine right the temporal supremacy over all civil governments. I think it occurs in vol. iv. of the collection.

it wise thus to divide the really faithful into two classes, when we need united forces? What practical good *can* the theory do? It certainly may do much harm. It is enough practically if all Catholics are convinced that the Pope must be free by some means—as I may say, by hook or by crook.

The use of the local sovereignty is to guarantee this freedom; and the use of this freedom is, that the Pope should be untrammelled in his great work of directing the families of men in matters of faith and morals. If no families of men obeyed him, his freedom would be useless, and its guarantee worthless. To risk such a misfortune for the sake of preserving the guarantee, would be like throwing away the jewel to keep the casket, destroying the soul to save the body.

P.

Correspondence.

OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES BEFORE THE REFORMATION.

SIR,—Will you allow me to offer a few remarks on an able and interesting paper, which has appeared in your September Number, discussing the question of identity in spirit and system between our great public schools and universities of to-day and their former selves when Catholic? I need scarcely say that I am not going to re-open the controversy, which has already been closed in your pages, as to the respective merits of the present public-school system and that which usually prevails in Catholic, especially Continental, colleges; but shall confine myself to the collateral question of fact, which is now for the first time directly mooted, as to which may most fairly be considered the modern representative of the institutions of Wykeham or Waynflete. And if I am not able to acquiesce, without further information, in all “A. M. D. G.’s” conclusions, he must not suppose me insensible to the valuable service he has rendered, by throwing additional light on the subject, or to the tone of candour and discrimination in which he has treated it. With much of what he says I heartily agree; but on some points his judgment appears to me at least premature, and his data insufficient for the inferences he has deduced from them. Let me proceed at once to explain my reasons for thinking so.

1. In the first place, no account of any such corporate organisation, which is mainly or entirely derived from the letter of its statutes, can be other than a most inadequate picture of its actual life. This is true even of contemporary institutions. The sound statesman-like judgment of the late Bishop Doyle seems, oddly enough, to have conceived the possibility of uniting the Irish Church

Establishment to the Catholic Church by a kind of parliamentary *coup de main*, because he looked at the Establishment *ab extra*, and judged it simply by the letter of its formularies. Consider, again, how strange, and even ludicrous, a misconception of Oxford life would be gathered from an exclusive study of the University Statutes, still in force, and a copy of which is, or lately used to be, presented to every undergraduate on his matriculation. But I need not multiply illustrations of what is sufficiently obvious. We all know how different a system looks on paper from that same system worked out by living men. Modifications, additions, and subtractions invariably grow up in practice almost before the ink of the original rules is dry, and much more in the lapse of ages. To attempt, then, to reproduce the life of Eton or Winchester in the fifteenth century from the letter of their statutes, would be somewhat analogous to the paradoxical attempt of a distinguished historian to re-write the reigns of the Tudors from contemporary acts of Parliament and their preambles. I am not saying that your contributor has done this; but he has certainly had mainly to rely for his conclusions on the letter of statutes, while of the other authorities he quotes some tell partly against him. Nor are there wanting, I believe, many records of mediæval Oxford life, which, like the "Reeves Tale," betray a state of disorder and immorality that would not be tolerated for a day under its present discipline, which I observe "A. M. D. G." considers quite sufficient for youths of the age placed under it. The state of things described by Chaucer may no doubt have been improved by subsequent collegiate rules; but one would be glad to know the extent and nature of the changes which actually took place. The discontented Cambridge scholar cannot surely be held to give a fair statement of average university life.

To revert to the statutes. They, of course, deal more with external regulations than with principles, and it must be remembered that the question of identity is mainly one of principle. Apart from all religious considerations, many changes of detail would necessarily occur in the course of years with the changes of national and social life generally. To reënact for a school of our own day the precise regulations of Winchester at its first origin, would not be to copy the work of Wykeham, but to caricature it. For similar reasons, the evidence of statutes must possess a chiefly negative value. Your contributor can hardly be wrong in inferring, from their significant silence, the absence of any system of *espionage*,—for that is a point pretty certain to have been legislated for, if intended to be carried out,—and the omission is highly important; but it would not be equally safe to limit the exact amount of liberty enjoyed by the boys to the literal permissions of the statutes, nor do they enable us to decide how far, *e. g.*, the "sense of honour" was appealed to as a motive power. It is in such points, however, that the gist of the question lies to a great extent. The mediæval knight was a very different personage from the modern gentleman, yet the one is the lineal descendant and representative of the other. The specialities of

chivalry pass away ; but tenderness, honour, and manhood are an imperishable bequest. Perhaps the question, under some at least of its aspects, might be stated thus : Did the system of our public schools and universities stand in the same relation to the chivalrous ideal of the fourteenth century as it now stands to the gentleman-like ideal of the nineteenth ?

2. There is, moreover, a special consideration in the case of collegiate statutes for which "A. M. D. G." appears to me not to have made sufficient allowance, though he has in one passage referred to it. Were they not mainly, if not entirely, enacted for the regulation of *foundationers*? This is a point which requires to be carefully noticed, when we consider that, probably from early times, the *peregrini*, who were from the first contemplated (at least in the foundation of Eton), outnumbered the foundation-boys ; and if the resident body in an Oxford college were mainly composed of those on the foundation, it can only have been because the immense majority of students did not live in colleges at all. It must also be remembered that the foundationers formed an ecclesiastical, one might even say in the case of the universities a quasi-monastic, corporation, as is evidenced by the obligation to take holy orders imposed on most of them. If, then, the statutes were mainly designed for *them*, they cannot surely be accepted, without great reserve, as representing the educational ideal of their day for the mass of self-supporting and of non-ecclesiastical students.

3. Has your contributor given sufficient prominence to all points of similarity between our ancient and modern public schools, which may be gathered even from his own references to the statutes? He speaks in one place of the monitorial or fagging system as though it were a special creation of Dr. Arnold's. Yet he must surely be aware that Dr. Arnold only developed and utilised for good an instrument he found ready-made, and which had, in fact, existed all along at our public schools. It is difficult, I think, to read the Eton statute, which he quotes (p. 356), without recognising in it something more than the mere germ of that monitorial system which has become one of the most distinctive features of the public schools. The duty of superintending, punishing, and, in certain cases, "denouncing" to the head-master, is still recognised and acted on. At some schools (I believe at Winchester) the monitors enforce silence for a certain time night and morning in the dormitories and rooms for private prayer. No doubt their powers may be, and often have been, greatly abused, and it may be admitted that it is in a great measure through Dr. Arnold's influence that they have come to be again directed to moral and religious ends. But the framework of the system was there all along, constituting a marked point of identity with its Catholic prototype, and of divergence from its Catholic contemporaries.

Before quitting this statute, I am tempted to ask whether, in translating *magistrum informatorem* "prefect of discipline," your contributor is not transferring to the foundation of Eton the ideas

of a different system and a later age. I speak under correction ; but *magister informator* is the technical term for the *head-master* at most of our public schools,—a very different officer from the prefect of discipline of a modern Catholic college, and the head-master of Eton is surely the natural person to be mentioned next after the provost and vice-provost.

4. Your contributor is startled at the notion of the present condition of our public schools being “a development, or even perversion,” of their Catholic antecedents, and laughs at the idea of the present Catholic college system having “dropped from the clouds” at the time of the Reformation. Yet it is surely far more startling, to me it seems well-nigh inconceivable, that any thing like the “present Catholic theory of education” should have been *silently* changed at the Reformation into any thing like the present public-school system. If so momentous a revolution took place, and that in a nation so doggedly conservative as England, there must be some records of it left. I do not say there are none ; but if there are any, let them be produced. The fact noticed by “A. M. D. G.” (p. 354), that one of the most “monastic” statutes of Winchester was still in force at the beginning of the last century, hardly looks like it. Nor is it at all necessary to suppose the modern Catholic system dropped from the clouds at the Reformation, when we recollect that it is elaborately formed on the Jesuit model, and that the Jesuits became at that period, and continued for some time afterwards, the leading educators of Catholic Europe. They were not likely to borrow much from the educational antecedents of a country of which they knew little or nothing, except that it had lapsed into heresy, and was, if possible, to be reclaimed to the faith.

These, then, are some of my reasons for going beyond your contributor in considering, as at present informed, the modern public-school and university systems, on the whole, and after due allowance has been made for the social and intellectual progress of four centuries, the truest living representatives of the ancient English ideal. The *onus probandi* lies on those who think differently. Clearly so ; for it is natural to assume, unless proof be forthcoming to the contrary, that in all matters not directly affected by the religious changes of the sixteenth century, the Eton and Winchester of to-day would be the rightful lineal descendants of their original selves, rather than Stonyhurst or Ushaw. It is natural, first, because we can trace the one system historically to an English, the other to a foreign, origin ; secondly, because, as was said above, it is gratuitous to imagine that a flood arose in the night, and swept away all traces of the ancient landmarks “while men slept,” leaving no memorial behind it. Of the religious changes in the sixteenth century we have ample records. Do they speak of any thing beyond ?

There are one or two subordinate points in which I might be disposed to join issue with “A. M. D. G.” I think, for instance, he scarcely does justice to the direct religious influences brought to bear in our public schools. When he ridicules the notion of the sancti-

fiction of their members being made their *finis ultimus* of education, he might remember that the head-master of one of the largest of them (Rugby) tells us, in the dedication of a recent volume of school sermons, that "he would gladly sacrifice all else to train up his boys in the spirit of the Bible." But I do not purpose dwelling on these matters. I have wished to confine myself to the historical question; and in doing so, my aim has been, not so much to offer fresh information, as to indicate what seems to be the general lie of the question, in the hope of eliciting new matter, if any is to be had, from those who may be in a position to supply it.

One or two extracts, however, shall be added in reference to our foreign seminaries, tending to show that the discipline was alien to the habits and character of Englishmen, and was not found altogether successful with them.

Among many complaints recorded by Father Parsons of the English youth at Rome, take the following: "Cardinal Baronius often told me that our youths bragged much of their martyrdoms; but they were *refractarii* (that was his word), and had no part of the martyr's spirit, which was charity and obedience. His Holiness often told me that he never was so vexed with any nation in the world. For on the one side they pretended piety and zeal, and on the other showed the very spirit of the devil in pride, contumacy, and contradiction. . . . His Holiness added also, that he knew not what resolution to take; for, on the one side, to punish them openly would be a scandal, by reason of the heretics; and if he would cast them forth of Rome, some had told him they would become heretics. . . . So as now many great and wise men begin to suspect that the sufferings of our blessed martyrs and confessors in England was not so much for virtue and love of God, as of certain choler and obstinate will to contradict the magistrates there."

There is much more to the same effect. This is, of course, the Italian view of the matter; but it any how implies that the right method of dealing with the English character had not been hit upon. Parsons accounts for it by the tender age at which the English students came to Rome, and the contrast between the English and Italian systems of education. In Italy, boys were at an early age initiated into matters that only men knew in England, and discussed the affairs of popes, cardinals, and princes. Hence "our youths, that were bred up at home with much more simplicity, and kept under by their parents and masters more than the Italian education doth comport, easily forget themselves, and break out into liberty." The English was the parental system; the Italian system made men out of boys by a precocious development of their intellect, and then restrained them from sins of which English boys knew nothing, by a constant supervision and espionage, against which our young countrymen revolted.

We find, again, in Dr. H. Ely's *Answer to the Apology of the Priests united to the Archpriest* (British Museum, Harleian Mss. 1875, p. 213), an account of the various "stirs" in the English Col-

lege, in one of which half the students left and joined the Benedictines. Another "stir," the account of which will not bear quotation, arose from certain measures of precaution and espionage implying suspicion of gross and disgusting immorality.

Take, on the other hand, the following account by an Italian, who wrote from Parsons' notes, of one result of the English plan of education founded on honour (Bartoli, *Istoria de la Comp. de Gesu : l'Inghilterra*, p. 106). It refers to 1580: "They (the Catholic priests) trusted more to the reputation of a Protestant, but a gentleman, than to the conscience of a plebeian, though he professed to be a Catholic ; and with reason, as experience demonstrated, far beyond all that men had a right to expect. For not from noble blood, which hated infamy more than death, but from the common herd, sprang those monstrous traitors, snarers, spies, false accusers, perjured witnesses, who have been written about so much that I need not write more of them here. Men as vile in mind as in origin ; shameless apostates, domestic traitors ; brought to their infamous trade, not by any doubt of the Catholic religion, but by the unhappy pelf they made by marketing their faith, and by selling the blood of priests and the lives of innocent Catholics to the parsons and persecutors."

But I will not further multiply extracts which have only an indirect, though a very obvious, bearing on the question.

Your obedient servant,

A.

CANON FLANAGAN ON THE LIFE OF EDMUND CAMPION.

SIR,—If I had known that a grave fault would have been imputed to the *Rambler* because I made no reply to certain criticisms of the very Rev. Canon Flanagan, in a letter printed in the *Weekly Register* and the *Tablet* of May 11, upon two passages of the third chapter of my *Life of Campion*, I should certainly have noticed them before ; and I now hasten to repair my fault, if fault it is, by an explanation.

And first, if any one is to blame, it is not the Editor of the *Rambler*. The passages criticised appeared among the "Communicated Articles," where opinions and representations are advanced, as in the "Correspondence," by the writers in their private capacity, and where "only such general responsibility is undertaken by the conductors as is involved in their being parties to the publication." This announcement was made in the clearest terms in your prospectus of May 1859, where also admission was promised to articles and letters, not otherwise objectionable, that take a contrary view, or even controvert the opinions advanced. I cannot suppose that any such letter of Canon Flanagan has ever been refused admission into the *Rambler* ; and it seems rather hard to expect the

conductors to note and to reply to all the criticisms which may appear in other journals.*

The reasons which prevented me from replying arose from the subject itself. I was blamed for "shallow reasoning" and bad criticism, because I quoted Hall's *Chronicle* to prove that both clergy and laity neglected to observe a general fast ordered by Wolsey in 1527, and that the laity called the Pope by an opprobrious name because he had meddled in politics. Canon Flanagan thinks this shallow because Hall writes "in a style palatable to the Reformers," and "takes every opportunity to vilify the Popes." But here it is not the Pope, but the English clergy and laity, that Hall was vilifying. These persons were notoriously disaffected to the Pope a few years later ; and Hall is perfectly good evidence of their disaffection in 1527. The objection needed no answer.

With regard to the next charge. "Now for the specimen of historical facts. We are actually treated to the old story, that Elizabeth made known her accession to Pope Paul IV., and that the latter replied she was a bastard, and had insulted him. This story might have been told and believed some twenty years ago. Lingard and Tierney were both misled by it ; but as both acknowledged their mistake, what are we to think of a writer who could thus deliberately repeat it?" The obvious thing is, to think that he was ignorant of Lingard and Tierney's acknowledgment, not that he deliberately repeated an exploded error. The story is one which appears first in Sarpi, then in Pallavicino, in Raynaldus, the continuator of Baronius, and I suppose in every Catholic historian down to the latest times. Canon Tierney rejects it in the advertisement to his fourth volume of Dod's *Church History*, on the authority of certain researches among the English archives made by Mr. Howard, of Corby. If I had known of these, I certainly should not have repeated the story, though I must own that whatever doubt they throw on it, they seem quite insufficient to prove it to be a pure fabrication, due only to the inventive powers of Father Paul Sarpi. I should never reaffirm the story without further evidence ; but, on the other hand, it seems equally hard to deny it positively and in all points.

Sarpi's story is this : "Elizabeth had her accession notified to the Pope by letters of credence written to Edward Carne, who had acted as her sister Mary's ambassador with the Pope. But the Pope, with his usual temper, answers that the realm of England is a fief of the Apostolic See ; that she, as a bastard, cannot succeed to the crown, and that he could not reverse the definitions of Clement VII. and Paul III. ; that it was unbearable audacity to assume the name of queen or the government of the realm without his approbation, and that she had deserved, by so doing, that he should utterly refuse to listen to her demands. But because he wished to act like a father to his flock, provided Elizabeth would consent to re-

* Our correspondent is right. Canon Flanagan has never written to us on the subject.—ED.

nounce her right, as she pretends, to the English crown, and would leave herself freely to his decision, he would do whatever was consistent with the dignity of the Apostolic See. Most people believed that the interference of the French king had contributed to the ill-feeling of the Pope ; for he feared that the Pope would grant a dispensation for a new marriage between the King of Spain and the Queen of England, and he thought it would be his best policy to cut the strings in the very beginning of the negotiation. But the queen, when she knew what the Pope had answered, wondered at the hasty temper of the harsh old man, and thought it best both for herself and her realm to have no further dealings with him."

There is no doubt that in its technical details this story is false from beginning to end. The documents published by Mr. Howard show that Carne never received official news of the queen's death, never received letters of credence from the queen, and therefore never officially communicated her accession to the Pope ; and therefore, again, never received the official reply given by Sarpi. It is true that the French began to intrigue at Rome immediately after Mary's death, and it is true also that Philip II. almost as quickly conceived the idea of marrying Elizabeth, and spoke of it at Rome.* It is true also that in general Paul IV. placed all his hopes in the French, and was inclined to listen to them.† But it is not true that Carne was expressly recalled from Rome on account of the Pope's having given this answer, nor, indeed, does Sarpi say that he was. He only says that when the reply became known—*comperto*—to the queen, she ceased to have dealings with Rome.

But is there any probability that there were any indirect dealings with Rome in the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, the conduct of which has been erroneously attributed to Carne ? Or is it likely that Carne himself received such a reply while cautiously exploring the feelings of the Roman Court about Elizabeth ? In the event of such a reply having been given non-officially to Carne, would he be likely to report it officially to his government ? Would it not more probably reach the English Court through the ordinary means of its low spies and intelligencers ? And lastly, is there any proof in Carne's letters that such a speech was not made ?

And first, with regard to the probability of indirect dealings with the Pope. Elizabeth's Roman policy from the beginning was double : publicly, to disown and affect complete ignorance of all the Pontifical decisions respecting her illegitimacy, because to take the public initiative in getting them reversed would be, she thought, to make an acknowledgment of their importance, and even validity, which was quite incompatible with her safety ; and, privately, to leave no stone unturned to induce the Pope voluntarily to annul the decisions against her, for she knew well the danger to which they would continually expose her. Thus she acted in 1570, after the publication of the sentence of St. Pius V. ; "which sentence," says

* Raynaldus, cont. of Baronius, ad an. 1559. i.

† Soranzo, in tom. x. of Alberi's *Relazioni Venete*, p. 57.

Theiner,* "though she made show of contemning and mocking, yet she sufficiently acknowledged its force when she had recourse to the Emperor that, at his prayer, it might be revoked by the Pope." St. Pius, however, replied to Maximilian: "We cannot quite understand why she makes so much ado about the sentence. For if she thinks much of our excommunication, why does she not return to the bosom of mother Church? But if she thinks it of no consequence, why does she make so much ado about it?" Had Sarpi before him any documentary proof of such an indirect negotiation of Elizabeth with Paul IV., if not through Carne, through some other agent?

Next, suppose any such indirect communication had taken place, or suppose only that Carne had been discreetly exploring the opinion of the Court about English affairs, is it probable, is it consistent with the known character of Paul IV., to suppose that he would have made such a reply? Any one that reads the accounts given of him by Soranzo and Mocinego, the Venetian envoys at his Court, in Alberi's collection of *Relazioni*, will see the verisimilitude of the story. The Pope used to say, "that the dignity of the Pontiff consisted in putting kings and emperors under his feet;" he "wished to be feared by kings and emperors, showing by his frequent discourses how little he thought of any one of them, and saying that the Pope, as Vicar of Christ, was lord of all temporal princes." The speech was so much in Paul's manner, that all succeeding Catholic historians have copied it from Sarpi without a doubt of its truth, and sometimes with an acknowledgment of its special propriety. "Ille" (Paul), says Raynaldus, "ut erat juris Pontificii assertor acerrimus, respondit," &c.

But now suppose, in the course of his non-official communication with the Roman *curia*, Carne had received such a reply, would he have transmitted it to his Court? The wary old man (*solers senex*), as Camden calls him, knew better. Just at the same moment, a less-experienced ambassador was receiving a severe reprimand from the English Council for reporting these very intrigues of the French. Howard, one of the English commissioners for concluding the Peace of Cambresis, wrote to the Council, March 2, 1559, that a new difficulty had emerged; that the French had suggested to the Spaniards a doubt whether Elizabeth was rightful queen, and whether the Queen of Scots was not true queen of England; and that the French were labouring at Rome to the Pope for the disabling of her highness to the crown, and intitling of the Queen of Scots thereto. To this despatch there are two answers among the records. In one the queen blames them for making "mention of matters touching our title, such as we cannot like any ways to hear of;" and Cecil adds, "we think it very strange that ye will attempt to write to us thereof in such manner as it seemeth ye do, and to seek to know our pleasure in such a matter, which ye ought neither to hear of nor to reason." In the second despatch the Council answer, "Truly, my lord,

* *Annales Ecclesiastici*, tom. iii. p. 596.

we be sorry to see the queen's majesty, our undoubted liege lady, to be thus spoken of, and think the matter neither *worth hearing nor answer*: . . . articulation of such a matter is nothing agreeable to your commissions, nor convenient for you to hear of." This shows what sarcastic point and truth there is in what Shakespeare makes Parson Evans say to Justice Shallow: "It is not meet the council hear a riot. There is no fear of God in a riot. The council, look you, shall desire to hear the fear of God, and not to hear a riot." Now Carne, both as a Catholic would be unwilling to make an irreparable breach between Elizabeth and the Pope, and as a wily old ambassador would be more knowing than to send home information which would only gain him a reprimand. So he did like other ambassadors of his time: he prophesied smooth things, he exaggerated the respect that was paid to him in his official capacity, and he ignored as far as possible every demonstration of contrary character. Mocinego's report, above referred to, is a case in point. It is amusing to hear him carefully explaining to the Council of Venice that, however rough Paul IV. might be to the ambassadors of the other powers, yet he was all sweetness with the Venetian envoy, who, though he got very few audiences, yet had more than any other.

But if such a speech had been made in the Roman Court, it would probably get to the ears of other ambassadors, through whom it might reach the English Council, either directly through their governments, or indirectly through the eavesdropping of intelligencers. Elizabeth might have heard of it, and acted upon it, without mentioning it in the correspondence with Carne.

Lastly, the facts that Carne narrates are not inconsistent with the speech attributed to the Pope by Sarpi. Carne writes, Feb. 16, 1559: "The French here *can obtain nothing* at his Holiness's hands against your Majesty; and his Holiness hath such respect to your majesty and to your realms, that *he will attempt nothing* against you or your realms unless the occasion be first given therehence, as I am credibly informed." The French were trying to get the Pope to "disable Elizabeth to the crown, and to entitle the Queen of Scots thereto." Carne reports that they could obtain nothing, and that the Pope would attempt nothing of the kind. On the other hand, the speech reported by Sarpi has no reference to the French intrigues, but only to the supposed indirect solicitations of Elizabeth that the Pope would voluntarily acknowledge her right to the throne, thereby tacitly repealing the definitions of Clement VII. and Paul III. The Pope angrily refused to do this, but offered pretty plainly, if Elizabeth would renounce her right *de jure*,—that is, would acknowledge the justice of the decisions of those other Popes,—to acknowledge her as *de facto* queen. This was just what the French did not want; they wanted to see Mary of Scotland, and her husband the Dauphin, on the English throne. So that in this respect Carne's report agrees in substance with that of Sarpi. The French, in spite of their influence with the Pope, had not gained what they wanted

—the disabling Elizabeth to the crown ; but perhaps they had succeeded in so incensing Paul IV. against her that he made the violent and indiscreet speech recorded by Sarpi.

On the whole, then, I conclude that, though the technical detail of Sarpi's story is clearly false, nothing has as yet been shown which proves that he had no foundation for the substance of it. We may easily suppose that the historian pieced up his story out of different documents. If he found a paper which recorded that Elizabeth's agent at Rome, in the beginning of her reign, received such an answer, he would supply from other documents the name of Carne ; he would naturally surmise, from the general practice, that the answer was given in reply to a notification of the queen's accession, and he would dress up the story in its probable raiment, as all other historians of his time would do. This raiment has been torn to tatters by Mr. Howard. The substance of the story remains, not clear of suspicion, but not disproved ; and we must await the publication of the documents relating to the history of the Council of Trent, long ago prepared for the press by Father Theiner, but unaccountably delayed or countermanded, and of those Venetian papers which Sarpi made use of, before we are entitled to pronounce it to be a pure fabrication.

These, then, are the reasons which prevented me from accepting Canon Flanagan's criticisms ; and they would still have prevented me from replying, if I had not learned that my silence was prejudicial to the *Rambler*.

THE WRITER OF THE LIFE OF EDMUND CAMPION.

Literary Notice.

Japan, the Amoor, and the Pacific. A Voyage of Circumnavigation in the Imperial Russian Corvette "Rynda," 1858-1860. By H. A. Tilley. (London : Smith, Elder, and Co.)—We only notice this able and well-written book in order to extract from it Mr. Tilley's account of the Catholic authorities in the island of Tahiti, the natives of which had been converted by English Methodists before it was taken under the French Protectorate in 1842. It was then expressly stipulated that the English missionaries should not be molested in their functions ; still the French government was acting within its rights when it resolved to assimilate the ecclesiastical system of Tahiti to that of France, which places the clergy under the control of the civil power by forcing the ministers of all denominations to be stipendiaries of the state. It therefore subjected the Protestant missionaries to the same rule as the Catholics ; and ordered each to settle in his own district, and receive a fixed salary from the state, instead of wandering from district to district, and drawing their means of support from the contributions of their

various congregations. All but two refused to submit to these terms, and left their flocks in charge of native ministers.

How were the French Catholic clergy to deal with a half-civilised Protestant community, thus left to its own internal resources? The method actually adopted is this. "The government is as tolerant and protective to Protestants as to Catholics, and the priests, with the Bishop at their head, are apparently still more so. They tell the natives that both forms are the same thing; that the object of both is to make men good and happy. They make no open efforts to convert: they visit, take interest in, and even advise, the native Protestant minister. And such is the surest means of attaining their end, if that end is the catholicising the native Protestants; and, of course, every Protestant will believe that it is. But to judge from the little I saw, and much that I heard, of Bishop Janssens and his vicar, I think they are both good and liberal men, and am sure they are clever ones, if only in this, that they do not make half-civilised men the bewildered arbiters of dogmas which, after all, are totally unnecessary to the practice of pure Christianity" (p. 353).

Mr. Tilley afterwards tells how he met the Bishop and his vicar, who invited him to their house. As he could not return with them, they recommended him to pass the night at Papoari; and the Bishop wrote a few lines in pencil to the native minister of that place, which, he said, would ensure him unbounded attention. "It's all the same that he's a Protestant," broke in Père Collette; "it's the same thing here, you know, Catholic or Protestant."

Whether this peculiar treatment of the Protestants of Tahiti is the result of the attitude of the French government and its discouragement of proselytism,—for the so-called Catholic government of France is, in Algeria and its colonies, far more anti-Catholic than that of England; or whether it proceeds from an opinion that by a little delay and patience the whole body of inhabitants can be gradually brought round, while the commotions resulting from the personal controversies that would arise if there were to be any attempt made to procure individual conversions, might frustrate the general conversion of the population; or whether it is judged safer to leave these semi-savages in their invincible ignorance of the few doctrines necessary to complete the circle of their Christianity, rather than to risk their acceptance of things which the English missionaries taught them to dread, or from whatever motive the policy of Bishop Janssens may arise,—the fact is worth observing for the sake of the principles which it involves.

Current Events.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Italian Revolution.

WE resume our calendar of the progress of the Italian Revolution, interrupted since May last. In the beginning of that month, Cardinal Wiseman, in describing the situation of the Pope, then recovering from an attack of illness, lamented that his tranquillity and happiness had become the sport of those whose duty it was to secure them at any sacrifice; that it was a matter of daily and fluctuating rumour whether or no he was to be handed over from one calling himself his son to another boasting of the same title, who were only haggling about the terms of the transfer. "The more gross injustices may have been accomplished; . . . the more personal insults may have been exhausted; . . . the act of spoliation may have been completed; he is now left hanging in what is intended to be ignominious suspense, whilst the dice are cast by political gamblers for his seamless robe of state, which two conjointly may never wear,—for that capital of the Christian world, the seat of his eternal pontificate,—to see whose it shall be,—a secular possession of one or many declared foes, no longer the object of the world's veneration." And the Cardinal suggested that no compromise is possible; that if the King of Italy enters Rome, the Pope must leave.

In May, Turin was agitated with the last scenes in the life of Cavour; the debates on the loan of 20,000,000*l.*, to patch up for the time the finances of the kingdom, which had been yearly sinking into worse confusion; the hopeless attempts to introduce order into the newly-acquired southern provinces, by means of a constitution dictated by haste and uncertainty, not to say by confusion, despondency, and disorder; the quarrel of Cavour and Garibaldi; the characteristic part taken by Cialdini in defence of the regular army,

and against the irregularity of Garibaldi's position and conduct both in the field and in the senate, followed by the apparent reconciliation of the three parties; the feast of the inauguration of the Italian kingdom; and the death of Cavour. At the same time, the relations between Rome and the Italian government were illustrated by the suppression of convents, and the confiscation of their property, in the Marches and Umbria, and the decree to put up the landed property for sale; against which a protest was made by Cardinal Antonelli to the diplomatic body at Rome, pointing out the "absolute nullity of the title" offered by the intruding government, and cautioning every one, Italians and foreigners, "from the illegal acquisition of property arising from the said spoliation." He also protested against the loan, because it would affect those provinces which the Pope still claimed.

Another quarrel arose from the wording of the decree which determined the administrative powers of the king's lieutenants in Naples and Sicily, whereby the "nomination and revocation" of Archbishops and Bishops was reserved to the king. It was, however, explained, that the Bishops were comprised in a long list of functionaries, some movable, others perpetual; and that the right of royal revocation only applied to those who were movable, not to those who had tenure for life, as magistrates and judges. The clergy and the new kingdom of Italy were also brought into conflict, upon the orders issued by Cavour for the religious observance of the Feast of the Unity of Italy, which was to take place on Sunday, June 2*d.* At Milan, the Chapter formally protested against the inhibition of Mgr. Caccia, the administrator, and announced their intention to take part in the ceremony in spite of him. Other scenes like this occurred, which Passaglia afterwards generalised into

a description which we shall quote below.

At this time also it was said that a French proposal for the solution of the Roman question had been rejected at Turin. The patrimony of St. Peter was to be guaranteed to the Pope, and guarded by Pontifical troops; the Italian troops not approaching within five miles of the city. The Romans to be Italian citizens, but only to exercise their political rights out of Rome. The French still to occupy Civita Vecchia for a time. This abortive proposal, which in Rome was believed to have been accepted at Turin, is worth recording in connexion with an analogous plan ventilated by Mgr. Liverani. At the time it was said to be backed by England, and only rejected by Cavour because he would not sacrifice his own popularity and influence in Italy, by giving up his great point of securing Rome for the capital.

When Cavour promised the Italians the possession of Rome within six months, it may be suspected that his object was rather to amuse the Republicans than to hold out any rational hope that his prediction could be accomplished. Throughout his career he had opposed Mazzini's end only by using his means, had made him powerless by making him superfluous, and had forced him to be inactive by doing his work for him. He had only protected Italy against the forms of Republicanism by providing free scope for Republican passions. And the cry "to Rome" was adopted by him from that party simply in accordance with the whole policy of his career; and he died just at the moment when it seemed that no other hand but his could guide the wild forces that he had let loose, and left his policy as a legacy to his successor, Ricasoli, who, probably with no more faith than Cavour in his ability to persuade the Emperor Napoleon to relinquish Rome, was yet obliged to echo the deceased statesman's declarations, and thus to adjourn the organisation of the incoherent masses of the kingdom, so hastily patched up, to an unknown period. It was proclaimed that the southern provinces never could be really united, or even pacified, till Rome

was the capital; and statesmen pretended to suppose that the mere sentiment of being governed from Rome rather than from Turin would at once allay all the passionate reaction, all the more or less profitable brigandage, that filled five of the southern provinces with rapine and slaughter. Still worse, they made this supposition the excuse for not taking measures that might have alleviated the difficulties of the situation. For if the position of Turin, so far to the north, was the parent of so much evil, surely matters might have been improved by the transfer of the government to Florence, a place in all respects but those of mere sentiment superior to Rome as the seat of a legislature and the centre of administration. The cry that Italy could not organise itself while it was maimed by not having Venetia, and while Rome, its heart, did not belong to it, rested on an absurd analogy, absurdly carried out; but it served as an excuse to the government for further temporising with the democratic party, instead of at once taking in hand those salutary and vigorous measures which will be found necessary, at some time or other, if the monarchy is to be preserved.

In the middle of June, Napoleon III. recognised the Italian kingdom, and renewed diplomatic intercourse with Turin. The following is a summary of the French note to the Italian government. "The emperor, on the demand of Victor Emmanuel, has recognised him as King of Italy. But by this recognition he does not approve the past policy of the Cabinet of Turin, nor does he encourage enterprises of a nature to compromise the general peace of Europe. The emperor regards the principle of non-intervention as a rule, and declines the responsibility of any project of aggression. The French troops will continue to occupy Rome so long as the interests which brought France to Rome are not secured by guarantees." Ricasoli answered in his note: "Our wish is to restore Rome to Italy, without depriving the Church of any of its grandeur, or the Pope of his independence." In the Chamber of Deputies, June 25, the minister thanked the emperor for his choice of the

occasion of making this "solemn manifestation," at a moment when he could thereby render less painful to Italy the great misfortune that had overtaken her, but assured the deputies that gratitude to France would never demand the least sacrifice of their rights and their interests.

On July 24, Ricasoli spoke, again indignantly denying any project of ceding Sardinia to France, and adding, "The king's government sees a national territory to defend and to recover; it sees Rome and Venice. . . . The opportunity which time is preparing will open the way to Venice; meanwhile, let us think of Rome. We wish to go to Rome. Rome, politically separated from the rest of Italy, will continue to be the centre of intrigues and conspiracies, and a permanent menace to public order. For Italians, therefore, it is not only a right, but an inexorable necessity. But we do not wish to go to Rome aided by rash and inopportune insurrectionary movements, which might compromise the national work. We wish to go to Rome in accord with France, not destroying, but building up, and at the same time opening to the Church a way of reform by giving her that liberty and independence which will invite her to regeneration,—a task to be accomplished by the purity of religious sentiment and simplicity of manners, by severity of discipline, and by the frank and loyal abandonment of that power which is opposed to the great idea of her institution."

On the other hand, at Rome, on St. Peter's-day, June 29th, after Mass, the Pope pronounced a new protest, and renewed all the declarations he made in the encyclical letter and allocutions of 1859 and 1860. About the same time he ordered, "not without great regret," the name of Mgr. Francesco Liverani to be struck from the list of the domestic prelates and apostolic notaries. This priest had been educated at the expense of the Pope, and owed every thing to his patronage; he had attracted attention by some valuable contributions to history from original documents, and he now surprised the world with a publication in answer to Montalembert's letter to Cavour, in which, though he

combats the views of the Turin Cabinet, yet he vies with M. About himself in the hostility of his tone to Cardinal Antonelli and the Roman court. Perhaps he adopted this line in order to recommend his book to the fervid youth of Italy, who, he says, are so maddened by the opposition of ecclesiastics to their political aspirations, that they are only prevented by foreign bayonets from murdering every priest in Rome. But the correctness of his details has been vehemently denied, and even his sanity impugned, in the *Civiltà Cattolica*. The scandalous part of his book, however, is only an introduction to those pages where he combats all the solutions of the Roman question which have been proposed by others, and offers a new one of his own, that seems to have been intended to recommend the French proposal rejected by Cavour, to which we have referred above.

The following is an outline of Liverani's view: The Papal States must be restored to the Pope; the King of Italy must not hold them either as his own or as a Papal fief. The latter solution, though in accordance with canonical precedents, would be an anachronism, and would soon result in final separation. Equally impossible is Massimo d'Azeglio's idea of making Rome a kind of Hanseatic town, or Levitical city of refuge, with an independent territory and senate; for when Rome was governed on this plan the Popes were in perpetual exile, and the restoration of that constitution would make Rome the refuge and hotbed of all the revolutionists of Europe. Prince Napoleon's plan (reverted to in a Parisian pamphlet of October 15th), to give the Pope the Vatican and the Trastevere, and to enthrone the King of Italy on the Capitol, is insane. It would shut up the Pope in a kind of *Ghetto*; the proximity of the rival powers would lead to all kinds of intrigue among the diplomatists at the Italian court; it would be impossible for the populations of the two sides of the river, one enjoying liberal institutions, the other ruled by the Index and Holy Office, either to mix, or to be separated, without a stringent system of passports and guard-houses in the middle of each bridge. As to the maintenance of the Papal court, the

plan which would secure the Pope annuities from the consolidated fund of each Catholic state would reduce him to the condition of a Torlonia or a Rothschild; not to mention the danger that each court would suspend payment every time the Pope was unable to comply with its "legitimate" demands. As to the Pope's continuing to reside in Rome,—to send him to Jerusalem with the title of king *in partibus* is mere drivelling; there is no necessity for his departure from Rome, because there is no need for the King of Italy to make Rome his capital. Rome is no fit centre for a constitutional government; its ecclesiastical character, its traditions, the fact that since Constantine no Cæsar could ever reside there in face of the Pope, the unhealthiness of its site, the character of its buildings, and the nature of the population, all forbid its being made the headquarters of the liberal government of a great constitutional kingdom. The Pope, then, must remain in Rome, and be governor of the States of the Church, though these states, as by the Constitution of Charlemagne, must be in temporal subjection and allegiance to the King of Italy, the legitimate representative of King Berengarius, and of the short-lived imperial dynasty of the Italians. Victor Emmanuel should be elected Emperor of the Romans; when, by the very terms of the canon law, the people of the Roman States would owe allegiance to him, and then, like the Cæsars of old, the new Emperor should abandon Rome to the Pope, and fix his capital elsewhere.

It will be seen that this plan is precisely that attributed to the Emperor Napoleon, with the addition of the proposition of making the Italian crown imperial. The book abounds with panegyrics of the Napoleonic policy, and is written in the French interest, probably with a view of backing up the French proposal, though the author has been wrongly confounded with the Piedmontese party.

In the middle of July, the state of the Neapolitan provinces led Ricasoli to appoint General Cialdini king's lieutenant in Naples, with full civil and military powers. The severe measures he was obliged to take, and the small success that attended them

drew from Massimo d'Azeglio a remarkable letter, of which the following are the principal passages. "2d August 1861. . . . The question of holding or not holding Naples depends, I suppose, mainly on the Neapolitans, unless we wish to change at our convenience the principles which we have hitherto preached. We advanced with the profession that governments not enjoying the consent of the people were illegitimate; and with this maxim we caused some Italian princes to decamp. Their subjects made no protest, and so expressed their consent to our work; . . . so far our acts were in accord with our principles. At Naples, likewise, we drove out the king, to set up a government founded on universal consent; but we want sixty regiments and more to keep the kingdom in order; and it is notorious that, brigands or no brigands, no one will recognise it.

"But, you will say, there is universal suffrage. I know nothing of suffrage; but I know, that while on this side the Tronto we want no regiments, they are wanted on the other side. There was, then, some mistake; and we must change our dealings or our principles. We must ask the Neapolitans once again, and for good, whether they want us or not. I comprehend that Italians had a right to fight those who wished to keep the Austrians in Italy; but for Italians who, remaining Italians, do not wish to unite with us, I think we have no right to shoot them; except, for brevity, we adopt the principle on which Bomba bombarded Palermo, Messina, &c."

This defection from the cause of Italian unity, and the very natural solidarity of the Roman government with the partisans of Francis II. against their common enemy, called forth a circular from Ricasoli to the foreign agents of his government, dated August 24th. We give an outline of his circular, partly in his own words, partly in brief.

"No new circumstances," he says, "have arisen to diminish the confidence of the government in the patriotism of the southern provinces; but as the brigandage is now redoubling its efforts, and as the coöperation of its auxiliaries has increased, and as acts of unheard-of cruelty have provoked

corresponding repression, these facts have been used as the ground of a stronger protest against the Piedmontese oppression of an unfortunate country, 'forced by trick and violence from its legitimate master, to whom it desires to return, even at the cost of martyrdom.' Moreover, honourable men, strongly Italian by old affection and profound conviction, incline to the belief that the union was made inconsiderately, and should be put to the proof of a fresh experiment. Ricasoli, however, declares it impossible even to doubt the legitimacy or the efficacy of the *plebiscite*; henceforth no united province can ever declare itself separated from the rest. 'The Italian nation is constituted, and all that is Italy belongs to it.'

After this preface, Ricasoli proceeds to explain the state of the case in the Neapolitan provinces.

"Wherever the form of government and the dynasty have had to be changed by a revolution, there always remain, to trouble the new order of things, for a period more or less long, a leaven of the past, which cannot be got rid of without fratricidal conflicts." He instances Spain, England with the Jacobites, and France with the Girondists and Vendéans; and yet the acts of repression of the Spanish, English, and French governments were ever considered justifiable, and the armed resistance has been called rebellion, though it had regular armies, experienced generals, territories and fortresses, and had to be put down by a regular war and by pitched battles; but in the Neapolitan rebellions all these conditions are wanting, for the movement, for the most part, is not political at all; and the baron quotes the English consul Severn, who reports to his government: "The bands of malefactors are not so numerous as they seem; but they go about every where; . . . rob travellers and pillage hamlets. . . . The old Bourbon flag has been raised in some places, but it is certain that the movement has no political character, and that it is a system of agrarian Vandalism (?), embraced as a profession by a great part of the disbanded troops, who prefer pillage to labour." Yet such soldiers and freebooters may be an instrument in the hands of the reaction; but it would be an error to

regard it as an armed protest of the country against a new order of things, or to suppose it as important as it has been said to be.

"Of the fifteen provinces which composed the kingdom of Naples, five only are infested with brigands. Not that they occupy these provinces, or are established in any town or village; but they live in small bands on the mountains, and descend upon defenceless places for booty. They never dare attack even a third-rate town, or a position guarded by troops, however few; but where they enter they open the prisons, and, with the help of the criminals and the marauding peasantry, they rob and pillage, and then take to flight.

"Brigandage, as thus practised in the Neapolitan provinces, is not a political reaction, but a natural fruit of the wars, the frequent political commotions, and the rapid changes of bad governments, which have desolated those provinces; it prevailed under the Spanish and Austrian viceroys, altho up to 1734, under the Bourbons, under Joseph Bonaparte, and Murat. It is therefore accounted for by historical precedents and the habits of the country, to which we must add the excitement of political revolution, and other special causes, namely, the bad government of the Bourbons, denounced by the Congress of Paris as barbarous and savage, and called by Mr. Gladstone the negation of God. The principle of the Bourbon government was the corruption of every thing and every body—a corruption so universally and persistently carried out, that every thing which in tolerably organised governments serves to strengthen, to discipline, and to moralise, there only served to weaken and deprave. 'The police was a privilege accorded to an association of malefactors to harass and plunder the people as they pleased, and to exercise espionage for the government. Such was the Camorra. The army, with certain exceptions, was composed of elements carefully selected, scrupulously trained by the Jesuits and chaplains in the most abject and servile idolatry of the king, and in the blindest superstition. It had no idea of duty towards the country; its only duty was to defend the king against the citi-

zens, considered as essentially enemies, and in a continuous state of rebellion, at least in intention.' Rebellion was the gain of the army, because it then had free range for its covetousness and passions,—moreover there was nothing to maintain discipline, or to produce an *esprit de corps*; the soldier had no love for his country: he was only required to be submissive to the king, who flattered him. There were 100,000 of them, well armed, paid, and placed; and yet they did not fight, but continually retreated before a handful of irregulars; regiments, even a complete division, submitted to be taken prisoners. It was thought that such men would never make good soldiers, so they were disbanded; but, accustomed to a life of idleness and dissipation in barracks, and unused to labour, they became brigands. If they sometimes displayed the Bourbon flag, it was from habit, not affection. As they had dishonoured themselves by not defending their flag, so now they dishonoured their flag by making it the emblem of murder and pillage."

After thus tracing the formation of the brigandage, Ricasoli relates how it came to be a political instrument.

"The dispossessed King of Naples resides at Rome in the Quirinal, and he there coins the false money with which the Neapolitan brigands are freely supplied. The offerings extorted from the Catholics throughout the different countries in Europe, in the name of Peter's Pence, are employed to enrol these brigands in every part of Europe. They go to Rome to inscribe their names publicly, to receive the word of order, and the blessing[*of the Pope*]. From Rome they obtain the immense quantities of arms and ammunition which they require.

"On the Roman and Neapolitan frontiers there are depôts and places of rendezvous and refuge, . . . as is proved beyond doubt by the late perquisitions of the French. The hostile attitude and language of part of the clergy, the arms and proclamations found in convents, the priests and monks taken in the ranks of the brigands, prove beyond all doubt whence and in whose name all these instigations proceed. And as there are here no religious interests to defend (and

even if there were, their defence by such means could not be tolerated), it is evident that the connivance and complicity of the Roman court with the Neapolitan brigandage are founded on the solidarity of temporal interests, and that the object now is to keep the southern provinces in a state of revolt, and to prevent the establishment of a regular government, in order that the sovereignty of the Pope may not be deprived of its last support in Italy."

Hence Ricasoli trusts that all will see that the temporal power is condemned, not only by the irresistible logic of the national unity, but also by its proved incompatibility with civilisation and humanity.

"But," the baron proceeds, "even granting the movement to be essentially political, no argument can be drawn from it. Its duration is nothing, because from the nature of the country, close to the Roman frontier, it is impossible to surround the bands. And that it is not upheld by half the population, is proved by the fact that there have been no insurrections to join them, that they have no party in the press, and that the National Guard and volunteers are all against them. 'At the present moment, differences of opinion are disappearing; the various sections of the liberal party rally round the government, so that neither the regular nor the local forces have experienced a single defeat. For more than a year, in the midst of so much uncertainty, anxiety, and change, in the exercise of a new and unrestricted liberty, Naples, that great city of 500,000 inhabitants, has not raised a single cry of disunion, has not permitted the realisation of a single one of the thousand Bourbonist conspiracies which are continually springing up, to disappear immediately.'

"Hence it is clear, that the Neapolitan brigandage has no political character; that the European reaction, established and countenanced at Rome, fomented and supports it in the name of the dynastic interests of divine right, and in the name of the temporal power of the Pope, taking an abusive advantage of the French arms placed there to guarantee more elevated and more spiritual interests; that the Neapolitan populations are

not hostile to national unity, nor unworthy of liberty, as some persons would have it believed.

"The civilisation of the present age cannot tolerate that schemes of subjugation should be prepared at the seat and centre of Catholicity, not only with the connivance, but with the countenance of the ministers of the Pope. Religious men are indignant at the abuse of sacred things for ends altogether temporal. Rome is compromising her religious without promoting her worldly interests. The conviction of this, already attained by every upright mind, will facilitate the task of the Italian government, which is that of restoring to Italy and to the Church her liberty and dignity."

On the very day when this circular of Ricasoli's was made known to the public, a pamphlet appeared at Paris, called *L'Empereur, Rome, et le Roi d'Italie*, which, in spite of official disavowals, has been supposed to contain the view of the imperial government. It declares that the policy of the reaction is to make the Neapolitan provinces another Vendée, and Rome another Coblenz; and that the movement is less a civil war than a brigandage on a large scale, excited and paid from Rome by the ex-king of Naples with the gold of Legitimists and priests, as the Count of Artois formerly paid the Chouans from London with English gold. This is the theme of the first chapter. The second maintains that a united Italy, instead of being an object of fear for France, accords with French interests, and that the union is incomplete without Rome; that the Italian nation has a right to its capital, and that the capital of Italy is Rome. Chapter iii. is a savage attack upon the government of Rome for treating men, like cattle, as property; and for adverting "against Italy," land and inhabitants, "the principle of expropriation for religious utility." It argues that civilisation requires the separation of temporal and spiritual power; that the Pope may be as independent without a kingdom, as the French Bishops and priests without their old domains; that his temporal power has been lessened, therefore it may be annihilated; that it is of human origin, therefore not eternal; that the French

occupation was intended to conciliate religion and nationality; that the nation has made every advance, while the guardians of religion have refused all concession; that all Italy is now attracted to Victor Emmanuel, and the Romans have been drawn within the magic circle; and that Europe, which was so alarmed at the triumvirate of 1848, will be content to leave Rome in the hands of the constitutional king. Chapter v. says that the Italian government has offered every guarantee, material and moral, to secure the independence of the Sovereign Pontiff, and recommends the Pope to submit.

About a month afterwards a supplementary pamphlet was published, with the title, *Guarantees given by the King of Italy for the Independence of the Holy See*. The conclusion was, to abolish the temporal power; to intrust the personal security of the Pope to the filial loyalty of the King of Italy, and to place the independence of the Holy See under the guarantee of the powers. The person of the Pope to be inviolable and sacred, as also those of the Cardinals. The Papal States to be united to the kingdom of Italy. Rome to be the capital of Italy, and to remain the seat of the Sovereign Pontiff. His Holiness to retain all the honours he has hitherto enjoyed; to have accredited ambassadors and ministers, enjoying the same immunities and privileges as the members of the diplomatic body; to keep his propaganda, his penitentiary, and his archives; his palaces and goods to be exempt from all taxes, jurisdictions, or domiciliary visits. According to this plan, the church and piazza of St. Peter, and the palace of the Vatican, with its dependencies, would be secured to the Pope and his successors. He would receive, instead of tithes from the public revenues of his old states, so much a year from the consolidated fund of the Italian kingdom, while each Catholic power would be invited to guarantee him a proportional income, under the title of Peter's Pence. He would be entreated to create Cardinals of different nationalities, in proportion to the numbers of Catholics in each nation, which would provide for its own Cardinals, and for its proportion of the Pope's guard of

honour, to be chosen by his legates from each state. These guards alone, during vacancies of the Holy See, would be allowed to approach the palace of the conclave. The King of Italy would engage solemnly before God, kings, and people to protect the person of the Pope, to take care that the independence of the Holy See remains entire, and that the prescriptions necessary for this independence be maintained. He would make known his resolve to give the Church in Italy a greater liberty than it enjoys in any other country of the globe,—this liberty to include the direct nomination of Bishops by the ecclesiastical authority, without the intervention of the state; the right of assembling synods and councils; free correspondence with the Pope, and a complete latitude for the publication of pastorals and of bulls. This spontaneous concession of the Italian government, it is argued, would probably lead to similar measures in other countries, especially after the Papal sovereignty had become once more simply spiritual.

It is clear, continues the pamphlet, by what is going on in France, that the nomination of Bishops by the government does not produce the results expected, but rather compromises the government; and that the public councils of 1850 produced fewer evils than the private meetings of the present day. It maintains that there is no danger in free communication with the Pope, as Belgium proves; that these antiquated precautions are impossible with our ports and railroads, and are therefore both vain and odious; that the liberty of the press makes the civil authorisation of the introduction of bulls illusory; and that as for pastorals, public opinion and the common law give better guarantees than the old appeal to the Council of State. The old precautions, it says, were chiefly measures of reprisal against a Church which interfered in matters of state; in the new order they will be no longer needed.

Similarly, we are told, the King of Italy will grant perfect liberty of education and of religious associations; because he has full confidence in the good sense of the people, and in their patriotism, and a people come to maturity has no longer need of all those

legal protections which were necessary to secure the liberty of individuals in the infancy of society. Such was the pamphlet.

It is certain, in spite of the criticisms upon Ricasoli's circular that appeared in the semi-official press of Paris, and in spite of the official disavowals of these two pamphlets, that the French Emperor has quite changed his mind since May, when he seems to have considered a mitigated temporal sovereignty to be still possible, and has come to the conclusion that the whole system must be entirely wiped out, and the Pope entirely deprived of all temporal sovereignty, and of all civil power. And as the scheme of May found a clerical advocate in Liverani, so that of August found a pleader (actor) in Passaglia.

But before we pass on to Passaglia's pamphlet, we must notice the protests and contradictions that Ricasoli's circular called forth.

The official journal of Rome abstained from describing the document, on the ground that it had been already judged by all good men in Europe. It confined itself to declaring that the assertions of the Piedmontese minister concerning the attitude of the Holy See, which Piedmont had iniquitously and unjustly robbed, were a tissue of calumnies. "It would be unworthy to pause an instant to demonstrate the falsity of the assertions made with singular imprudence in the document in question;" and an appeal was made to the ambassadors and consuls at Rome, and to the French army of occupation, to bear witness to the falsehood of Ricasoli's insinuations. A few days afterwards, a semi-official French journal was authorised to declare that all the powers without exception had acknowledged the truth of the Roman government's statements in protest against Ricasoli. Another Roman paper had the unhappy thought of publishing a forged protest of the exiled nobility of Naples against the same circular; but it was obliged soon to confess its error. The Turin papers replied to the contradiction by publishing what purported to be a diploma and instructions, proving the existence and explaining the organisation of a permanent Bourbon conspiracy at Rome. But we have no

means in this case of judging between spurious and genuine documents. A protest was also published in the name of Francis II.; but as we have not seen it, we can give no extracts.

Controversies do not go for much unless it can be ascertained that the parties affirming and denying are really discussing the same points, and are using words in the same sense. The Roman government might well resent and contradict a document that reproached the Pope as being the head of a band of brigands, and yet it might be true that his government was encouraging a legitimate reaction against an intruding usurper, supplying arms to the recruits of the royalist army, and identifying his interests with those of his ally. Ricasoli, when he wrote the circular, held in his hands documentary evidence of the solidarity of the Roman government with the Neapolitan reaction in the interests of the temporal sovereignty of the Pope; this fact is authentic, though of course the opposite parties will call it by different names, and estimate it differently.

As Liverani was the clerical advocate of the propositions of May,—propositions distasteful in themselves to the union party, and clumsily recommended to them by an attack on the Roman administration which, if true, proved it to be as unfit for the modified sovereignty which he proposed as it was for the absolute government it claimed,—so the thorough-going conclusions of August found a more able defender and pleader in the Abbate Passaglia, the great Roman theologian, to whom the process of the Immaculate Conception was committed. His pamphlet, *Plea of a Catholic Priest for the Italian Cause, addressed to the Catholic Episcopate*, begins with a preface, the topics of which are significant enough. Though men, he says, who seek truth, and not triumph, attend rather to the arguments brought forward than to the man who brings them, yet men in general depend rather on authority than on reason, and accept persons rather than science. In deference to this feeling, the author brings forward his own claims to be heard. First, he is a real and sincere Catholic, attached with all his heart to the Christian creed in its integrity, and to the hierarchy and discipline of

the Church; yet, besides the hierarchy of sacred orders, he begs his readers to consider that they also are a royal priesthood, different indeed from the hierarchical priesthood, but a constituent part of the Church (so that, as Tertullian says, *ubique tres, ecclesia est, licet laici*), and a part which has often taken an important share in religious controversies. But the writer is more than a layman—he is a priest; and he quotes the well-known passages from St. Jerome, and refers to eight other Fathers, in proof of a certain coördination and equality between priests and bishops in all matters but the laying-on of hands. Not but that the Bishops are the apostolic order, the overseers of the flock, the summit of the priesthood; still priests have a right, with becoming modesty, to give their opinion in times of struggle, in order to smooth down difficulties, and to reconcile dissensions.

Such are the topics of the preface, and it is not difficult to see what application the author intends them to have, when, as he says, nearly all the laity, and, as he implies, a party among the priests, stand aloof from the Episcopate in the course which they are pursuing. The preface has the air of a humble apology for a poor and unworthy priest who dares to speak on one side while all his superiors take the other; but there occasionally crops out a consciousness of an overwhelming material force to back up his plea.

Then comes the following argument. The unity of the Catholic faith, in the confession of one God, one Christ, and one Church, is consistent with a certain plurality, distinction, and variety on all these points: in the one God are three Persons; in the one Christ two Natures; in the one Church many members, on whose multiplicity and variety in their unity he adduces testimonies of the Fathers. But the adversary has attacked this unity on all points: the unity of God and of Christ by the early heresies, the unity of the Church chiefly by the schism of the sixteenth century; yet this unity shall never be destroyed,—the gates of hell shall never prevail against it. But single churches may suffer shipwreck; and the present aspect of the Italian Church is sufficient to rack a man's heart. "For who so blind as not to

see that Italy is in so miserable a plight that the majority of her children are in the greatest proximate danger of falling from the Church either openly and bodily, or by a hidden and spiritual separation, and Mother Church herself in danger of losing her choicest sons? A great part of the clergy dissents from the majority of the laity; almost all the pastors are separated from their flocks; and the Pastor of pastors, the successor of St. Peter, the visible Vicar of Christ upon earth, fulminates excommunication and censures against the kingdom and people of Italy. You would think that the power of binding alone was left to the Bishops, so entirely are they occupied in blaming, rejecting, execrating what Italians, great and small, what the whole nation most ardently desires and most gladly embraces. And what is this? Have the Italians, like the English, German, Swedes, Danes, and many French, fallen from the orthodox creed? No, they firmly believe all its articles. Do they refuse obedience to their legitimate prelates in matters of religion? No, they are united in rendering to them the obedience commanded by God. Do they despise the supreme spiritual authority of the Roman Bishop and Supreme Pontiff? No, they reverence it. Do they madly attack, or cunningly undermine, the liberty which Christ purchased for the Church by His blood? No, they proclaim 'a free church in a free state;' they anxiously try all ways of healing the quarrel; after two or three repulses, they again ask for peace, and are unanimous in declaring that they will prove by their actions that they have no dearer wish than that the Church may enjoy perfect immunity and liberty." What is to be done, then, but humbly to implore Pope, Bishops, and clergy to remember St. Augustine's rule, "never proudly to exult over their erring children, nor to be hard in pardoning after rebuking." For, he proceeds, Bishops were divinely instituted in the Church as pastors for the common profit of their flocks; and their work is limited to religious usefulness and spiritual help, by preaching, by the sacraments, and by discipline. Hence St. Augustine recommends them, when they cannot be thus profitable, rather to resign

their sees than be the cause of troubling the peace of the Church. For the object of the institution of Bishops is to preserve the peace of Christ, and the concord of Christians. "But how do our Italian fathers in Christ, our pastors and masters, behave? The thing is too evident to admit of exaggeration. The population of Italy is overflowing with joy, but the Bishops with querulous voice and sorrowful speech are lamenting their loss. It is earnestly thanking God for the good things He has given, but the Bishops are judiciously warning it to appease God's wrath for the national sin. It flocks in crowds to the churches, but the Bishops drive away the congregations, and forbid them to enter the holy places. It wishes to offer to God the sacrifice of the altar, but the Bishops threaten to suspend the priests if they celebrate. In a word, there is nothing which the population most earnestly desires which the Bishops do not most earnestly pray to be delivered from. And what is this but to make their function a scandal to their flocks? to profess that Bishops are set in the Church for themselves, not for the people to whom they minister? What but to tear the members of Christ, instead of securing the peace of Christ? What but, in St. Augustine's words, 'to stint the Lord's gains for their own temporal dignity?' Christ's law is, that Bishops had better not be at all than be injurious to the peace of Christ, than help to scatter His flock, and to provoke a schism." The end of the existence of Bishops is the unity of the Church, as opposed to schism and division; and they are the types as well as the instruments of this unity. The Bishop of each church is the symbol and instrument of the unity of that church; the Pope, of the unity of the whole Church, that in him its unity might be both manifested and constituted. The writer spends many pages in proving this from the Fathers, and then applies his doctrine. "Wherefore the institution of Bishops in general, and of the Pope in particular, was and ever will be for this end, to preserve the unity, whether of particular churches or of the whole Church, and to insure her triumph over heresies and schisms. Unity was, is, and will be the end to which the hierarchy and its various

grades are directed by God. Those who endanger this unity damage it, or destroy it, are guilty of the greatest of crimes, and are enemies of the most merciful counsel of Christ. But now, do the majority of Italian Bishops nourish, protect, and defend unity, or do they agitate it, disturb it, ruin it, when they drive away their flocks, curse them, and separate themselves from the triumphant and thankful congregations as if they were heathens and publicans? . . . Unless concord very soon takes the place of discord, peace of war, and unity of division, the noble Italian Church seems more than in danger—upon the point of utter ruin.” Without the Bishop there is no Church; the Church is defined to be, “the people united with the priest, the flock adhering to its pastor.” So, if there is no Church where there is no pastor, there is also no Church where there is no people, no united flock. But what is the appearance of Christian congregations in several parts of Italy? Certainly not people united with their pastors; and what will happen if the division grows wider daily,—if the pastors every day depart farther from their flocks? The Italian churches are only relics, shadows, outlines of what they were, and they will gradually vanish away unless the prelates soon find out the way of peace, unless they remember what makes the difference between the shepherd and the hireling. And here he applies some very strong texts of Scripture to those against whom he is arguing, and hopes that they will profit by them.

He next proceeds to discuss objections to his argument. It will be answered, he says, it is absurd to suppose that the Pope and Bishops will ever come to terms with the Italians, approve their cause, and accept the new order of things. They have succeeded in checking the movement, if they have not put a stop to it; and what is to be feared? The Church may be oppressed, but never extinguished, if she suffers without consenting to the evil; in fact, schisms and divisions only serve to prove her and cleanse her, by casting out bad men. Yes; but in times of great agitation the bad are not cast out without many good being among them, as St. Augustine says: and then the unjust

excommunication only hurts the person who excommunicates. Hence it is never safe to excommunicate wholesale: “correction is never salutary, except when the man corrected has few followers.” This is the rule which St. Augustine deduces from St. Paul, and which the Church has adopted in the canon law. “But have the Italian Bishops or the Pope observed this rule? Had those whom they excommunicated no multitude of followers? Or were they few, and did almost all their countrymen disagree with them? Were they without powerful defenders, who might easily bring about a schism? Let the Bishops look whether the people take the side of the prelate who censures, or of the accused person who resists. Let them examine the state of men's minds, and see whether their excommunication corrects them or hardens them, cures them or slays them.”

But to examine the reasons alleged why the Bishops cannot accept Italian unity. They are two: (1) justice, and (2) the independence of the Pope. But is it perfectly certain that Italian unity cannot be accepted without *iniquity* by the Bishops, or by the Pope without *sacrilege and surrender of independence*?

First, St. Bernard declared that earthly causes of this kind, and the international quarrels of princes, are not those which Bishops have to decide; they must be left to the kings and princes of the earth. The authority of Bishops is in a higher sphere, namely, the interior court of conscience. They have no right to sit in the external court, and judge who is to possess the earth, but only to exclude sinners from heaven.

But I wish, says the author, that the Bishops would really examine the cause between the kingdom of Italy and the dispossessed princes,—they would then see that the charge of *injustice* is not so self-evident. The charge may be made without being proved. Or, if proved, it may only be made out with a degree of probability insufficient to justify opposition to the Italian kingdom, which is now *ipso facto* in possession. Unless clearly and evidently proved, no action can be taken upon it.

Now, is it so clear? Examine it either by the external rule of the

consent of well-informed men, or by the intrinsic rule of principles, and in either case the proof is incomplete.

For neither are well-informed men agreed upon the point; there is at least as much authority in favour of as against the kingdom of Italy; it may claim the benefit of the doubt. Nor is the argument from principles more conclusive against it. We have to consider what is the source of political power; whether the people may not, when it is necessary or useful, alter or entirely change the form of government; whether they have any right to assert their own liberty and autonomy; whether this right is superior or inferior to the acquired rights of princes; whether princes are bound not to assert their rights when they are in contradiction to the good of the people, and hinder their autonomy and full independence; what is the force of a *plebiscite* in determining social questions; finally, what is the force to be attributed to "accomplished facts." Now, can the Italian cause be clearly proved to be unjust on these principles? is it not rather doubtful, and neither manifestly just nor manifestly unjust? Nay, judged by these principles, is it not rather more just than otherwise?

Now, if the cause were clearly unjust, then *perhaps* the Pope and Bishops would be right in trying to overthrow it. But when the Italian kingdom exists *de facto*, and *de jure* is as likely to be just as otherwise, it can only be party-spirit and irritation, not justice, that makes the Bishops oppose it.

But granting, for argument's sake, that the Italian kingdom was vitiated in its source, yet the writer affirms that it exists *de facto*, if not *de jure*, from the Alps to Sicily. Now the constant rule of the Church in such cases, as laid down by Clement V., John XXII., Pius II., Sixtus IV., Clement XI., and Gregory XVI., is textually as follows: "The good of the Church, the salvation of souls, and the functions imposed by God upon pastors, requires that political contests should be let be, that controversies of human and civil law should be left to those whom they concern, and that the peace of the Church should be offered to kingdoms which exist *de facto*, and which are in possession, and that

nothing whereby Christian communion is enhanced should be refused to them."

But is this rule observed by the Bishops, and, much more, by the Pope? Does Pius IX. act as did St. Ambrose with Maximus, or St. Augustine with the Count Boniface, or St. Gregory the Great with the Emperor Phocas, the greatest traitor and monster that ever usurped a crown, but who was accepted by the Pope as the emperor *de facto*, and treated with all the respect due to Cæsar? If the clergy were to follow these examples, it would not be branded as Bourbon or Austrian, but it would be called simply Catholic, and regain its old popularity, by following St. Augustine's recommendation, "not to be so proud of its orders as to think it need not obey the temporal powers." Then there would be no more dissensions between Church and State, or between pastors and flocks; then the weak in faith would not be repelled from the Church and her ministrations; then we should not be asked, how it is that while the Bishops of Poland and Hungary sympathise with the wishes of their nation, our Bishops anathematise our wishes; or why our Bishops reject a *plebiscite* while the French Bishops accept it. Then follow more quotations, implying charges of temporal ambition, covetousness, pride, and want of charity against the Italian Bishops.

But since the Bishops must always adhere to the Chief Pastor, they will unite their voices with that of the Pope, and will never change till he lays aside his hostility to the Italian kingdom, and grants it peace. Now, will he do so? There are three great difficulties in his way.

The first is, "after the Pope's frequent and solemn declarations, he cannot approve what has been done, or bless the kingdom of Italy." But his declarations were not dogmatic; they were judgments on passing circumstances, and they ought to change as circumstances change. Now the circumstances of Italy are such that it is his duty, in order to preserve society, to reconsider his declarations. Obstinacy is not constancy; it is base to change a good resolution, glorious to change a foolish one.

But secondly, the Pope's oath,

whereby he has bound himself to preserve intact the patrimony of St. Peter, is the grand obstacle to any such change. Yet the oath was introduced by Pius V., and confirmed by Urban VII., with the single object of preventing portions of the states being granted to Popes' nephews, according to the custom at one time prevailing; so it does not apply in this case. Besides, no oath binds a man to do what is impossible; and if the precise terms of an oath become in time incompatible with facts, they may well be altered. The oath, then, should be considered in the following lights. Is it any longer morally or physically in the Pope's power to keep it? Is it for the benefit of the Holy See to refuse all change? Have circumstances so altered as to call for a change, when the Pope clearly cannot keep what he has, and when an equivalent or even better guarantee is offered? The writer answers all these questions like an Italian patriot. The better guarantee offered, and accepted by him in simple trust and confidence, is the famous "free church in a free state."

The third great difficulty is, that "the loss of civil sovereignty will lead to the loss of Papal sovereignty; and the loss of the political independence, given by God's special providence, will also endanger the spiritual independence of the Pope." And how can the Bishops be parties to advising the Pope to take such a course? But this necessity of temporal sovereignty for spiritual independence is completely a modern invention: for seven centuries, from Peter to Stephen, it was never heard of; and yet Silvester, Marcus, Clement, Cornelius, Damasus, Celestine, Leo, and the rest, were as independent as any of their successors, though not one of them had sovereignty, whether we take the word to mean royal power, or the majesty, glory, and honour that surround the chair of Peter. But neither of these comes from the institution of Christ, who gave simply a spiritual sovereignty and spiritual majesty, consisting in humility, and not in secular pomp. The sovereignty by itself is clearly contradictory to the spirit of the Gospel; its only possible defence is, that it is necessary to protect the independence of

the Holy See. This, says the writer, is the knot of the whole difficulty. Is political power necessary to secure the liberty of the Pope and of his ecclesiastical ministry?

Now, liberty means either (1) the right and full power of possessing or doing a thing, or else (2) a facility for possessing or doing a thing, hindered by none, or by the fewest possible obstacles. According to these two senses, the question resolves itself into, either, (1) is the liberty of a political sovereignty necessary or highly useful for preventing the Pope's right and full authority of binding and loosing, confirming his brethren, and feeding the flock of Christ, from perishing or being obscured? or, (2) is the political sovereignty necessary or highly expedient for the easy and free performance of this apostolic ministry?

Now, about the first question there is no difficulty; the Papal rights in the first sense of liberty are immutable, incapable of increase or decrease; and it is a point of Catholic faith firmly to hold and constantly to profess that the right and authority of the Supreme Pontiff has no dependence upon, no relations whatever with, his political sovereignty.

But with regard to ease and facility of performing his high functions, what freedom of action would be left to him if he were a subject? or how would he get over the suspicion of dependence, however free he was left? But has he complete freedom now? the question is not about absolute independence, but about the best guarantee. He has not perfect facility in performing all his functions now, and such facility is contrary to the predictions of Christ, to the nature of things, and the example of history. The Pope cannot be better off than the Church, and the Church militant is always to be like a ship tossed in a stormy sea. In fact, St. Augustine says, that the Church of Christ in all His saints was to serve (*servitutam*) under the kings of the world; and he calls it "sound doctrine, confirmed by the Lord's example," to hold that she must always pay tribute to them. The real source of Papal liberty is the same as that of all Christian liberty—God's making us new creatures. The good will is the true

liberty, and the Pope's best friends are those who exhort him, not to fight for an earthly sovereignty, but to imitate Christ most perfectly. The writer ends his argument with a well-known quotation from St. Bernard *de Consideratione*, where Pope Eugenius is told of the yoke of vile slavery that his temporal power imposes upon him, by loading him with worldly business, and robbing him of all opportunities of meditation and spiritual repose. "If ever," concludes the writer, "the state of human society appeared to require the union of a political sovereignty with the Pontificate, the aspect of things is now so changed, that nothing would seem more desirable for the Pope himself than the separation of the sceptre from the keys, of the tiara from the crown. This separation is demanded by the unwilling subjects of the Pope, who are kept down by foreign bayonets, and by the whole Italian people, who unanimously declare that they will no longer suffer the Italian kingdom to be without Rome for its capital. The most civilised nations of Europe agree that the civil sovereignty is the source of the greatest evils to the Papedom: these dangers can only be avoided by a change in the Pope's policy," &c.

This pamphlet has been put on the Roman Index; the author, having published it anonymously, was not allowed to defend it; and consequently we have not been told for what points it has been condemned.

The enthusiastic theologian has been carried away by his Italian patriotism to see what better politicians than he cannot see: he sees Italy one from the Alps to Sicily. Massimo d'Azeglio sees in this assumed unity only the result of a tyrannical appeal to force. Moreover, he sees in the mere promise of a government which has systematically oppressed and deceived the Bishops and clergy for the last twelve years a sufficient guarantee of the Papal freedom: such simplicity is rarely found but in the childish enthusiasm of a professor newly turned politician. And with this misplaced confidence in the good faith of the Italian government, he would vain persuade the Pope to stay in the Vatican while Victor Emmanuel is in the Capitol. For this purpose he has published, under the

name of Ernesto Filalete, another pamphlet, the argument of which is drawn from Holstenius, librarian to Pope Alexander VII., who ordered him to discuss the question, whether the Tridentine Canon, that obliged all Bishops to live in their dioceses *near their church*, obliged the Pope to live at the Vatican, or whether it was enough to live any where in Rome.

It may be patriotic, but it is clearly illogical, to apply the arguments of Holstenius to the present question; the Council of Trent orders the Bishops to reside in their sees in ordinary times, but makes no provision for such an extraordinary event as keeping the Pope weak and unarmed, in Rome, while the city is occupied by a government able and willing to impose conditions upon him which he does not think compatible with the safety of the Church, or with his duty as Pope.

The chief reply that Passaglia's pamphlet called forth was an allocution of the Pope, from which we only omit the passages which refer to the expulsion of the Cardinal Archbishop from Naples, and to the state of Mexico and Granada, and the peroration.

"THE ALLOCUTION DELIVERED BY OUR HOLY FATHER, POPE PIUS IX., IN THE SECRET CONSISTORY OF SEPTEMBER 30, 1861.

"Every one knows how the satellites of the Piedmontese government, and rebellion, full of cunning and deceit, and become abominable in their ways, have renewed the crimes of the heretics of old, and endeavour completely to subvert, if possible, the Church of God and the Catholic religion, to rob souls of its teaching, and to inflame all evil passions.

"All laws, divine and human, have been trampled under foot; all ecclesiastical censures despised; Bishops, with an audacity which increases daily, expelled from their own dioceses, and even cast into prison; many of the faithful people deprived of their pastors; priests, both secular and regular, crushed by ill-usage and exposed to every sort of injustice; religious congregations destroyed, their members driven from their homes, and reduced to utter need. Virgins

consecrated to God have been obliged to beg their bread; the most venerated shrines have been plundered, profaned, and changed into dens of thieves; consecrated things pillaged, ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction violated and usurped; the laws of the Church despised and trampled under foot. Schools of evil doctrine have been established; libels and infamous journals, works of darkness, have been distributed in all places, at an immense expense, by a criminal conspiracy. These abominable writings attack our holy faith, religion, piety, decency, modesty, honour, and virtue, overturn the immutable rules of the eternal law, of the law of nature, of public and private right. Individual liberty and property are attacked, the foundations of the family and of civil society are ruined, the reputation of all virtuous people is blackened by false accusations, and violated by the grossest insults. Unbridled license, and impunity of all vices and errors, are daily more and more propagated.

"Every body sees what a deplorable host of calamities and crimes has been heaped upon unhappy Italy in consequence of this great rebellion; for, in the words of the Prophet Osee, 'Male-diction, lying, murder, robbery, and adultery have flooded the world, and blood has been poured out upon blood.'

"Yes, our heart is filled with horror; words fail us to describe the towns in the kingdom of Naples burnt and destroyed, the number of virtuous priests and religious men, and citizens of every age, sex, and condition, not excepting even those pining under sickness, loaded with outrages, cast into prison, or put to death without so much as a trial.

"Who would not be filled with sadness to see these rebels, without any respect for the ministers of religion, for the dignity of Bishops or Cardinals, without any respect for us, for this Apostolic See, for churches, for justice, or for humanity, every where spreading devastation and ruin?

"And who are they who do these things? Men who do not blush to pretend, with the most impudent effrontery, that they wish to bestow liberty upon the Church, and to restore a moral sense to Italy. More than all this, they are not ashamed to ask the

Roman Pontiff to consent to acquiesce in their unjust desires, lest greater evil should redound to the Church.

"But that which causes us the greatest grief, venerable brethren, is, that several members of the secular and regular clergy, some of whom were even invested with ecclesiastical dignities, miserably hurried away by a fatal spirit of error and rebellion, and forgetful of their vocation and their duties, have strayed from the path of truth, have given their consent to the designs of the impious, and, to the great regret of good men, have become a stumbling-block and a scandal.

"Yet, in the midst of this pain, which we should never have been able to bear without God's especial support, it is a consolation to us to behold the virtue and courage of the Bishops of Italy, and of the whole Catholic world. These venerable brethren, attached to us and the See of Peter by the closest ties of faith, charity, and reverence, unintimidated by any peril, and fulfilling their ministry to the immortal honour of their name and of their order, cease not to defend intrepidly the cause of God, of His holy Church, and of this Apostolic See, its rights, its doctrine, and the cause of justice and of humanity. They cease not to watch most carefully over the soundness of their flock, refuting the false and erroneous doctrines of the enemy, and bravely resisting their impious efforts. We feel a joy not less great in seeing how the faithful priests and populations of Italy, and of all Christendom, tread in the footsteps of their prelates, and pride themselves more and more on publicly manifesting towards us and this Apostolic See their love and their respect, by defending our most holy religion.

And as their clergy and the faithful take the liveliest interest in the extreme embarrassment which has been caused to us by the spoliation of the greater part of our temporal dominions, they believe that nothing is more meritorious for them than to lighten, by their pious and spontaneous gifts, those very grave embarrassments.

"While we render thanks to God, who deigns, in this generosity of the episcopacy and of the faithful, to give us consolation and strength amid our sorrows, we also express anew,

before the world, our sentiments of profound gratitude, since it is exclusively by their help that we are able to support the great and increasing charges of this Holy See.

"Here, venerable brethren, we know not how to pass in silence the constant evidence of real affection, of unalterable fidelity, which the Roman people have lavished towards us. Desirous of giving striking proof of the tenacity with which it firmly holds itself attached to us, to this Apostolic See, and to this temporal sovereignty which belongs to us, it repels and condemns with the greatest energy the culpable intrigues and endeavours of those who seek to lay snares in its path, and to spread trouble in its bosom. Have not you yourselves, venerable brethren, witnessed, over and over again, the sincere, undisguised, and cordial manifestations by which this Roman people, which we so much love, has

displayed its sentiments of traditional faith, a faith which deservedly merits the greatest praise?

"Now, as we have the divine promise that our Lord will be with His Church until the consummation of the world, and that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her, we are assured that God will not break His word, and that a day will come, a day of wonders, when God will show that this formidable tempest has not been raised to submerge the bark of the Church, but rather to bear it up the higher."

Here the Pope seems to imply that he will not consent to any transaction with a revolution which has pursued an end that is against the interests of the Church, by means so atrociously unjust to her ministers and her religious. Such is the present aspect of the Roman question.

* * The article on "The Education Commission" was inadvertently placed among the "Editorial" articles. It was intended to stand in the "Communicated" division.

TO READERS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

THE Conductors of the RAMBLER having found it necessary to change their Publishers, think it right to state that they contemplate no further alteration in their existing arrangements. They profess no other object in their labours than that which has been the animating principle of the Magazine hitherto, viz. to coöperate with Catholic periodicals of higher pretensions in a work of especial importance in the present day,—the refinement, enlargement, and elevation of the intellect in the educated classes.

It will be their aim, as it has ever been, to combine devotion to the Church with discrimination and candour in the treatment of her opponents ; to reconcile freedom of thought with implicit faith ; to discountenance what is untenable and unreal, without forgetting the tenderness due to the weak and the reverence rightly claimed for what is sacred ; and to encourage a manly investigation of subjects of public interest under a deep sense of the prerogatives of ecclesiastical authority.

The contents of the Magazine are disposed under the five heads of editorial articles, communicated articles, correspondence, current literature, and current events.

As regards the opinions and representations advanced under the second and third heads, only such general responsibility is undertaken by its Conductors as is involved in their being parties to the publication ; and for this reason admission will readily be granted to articles, otherwise eligible, which take a contrary view, or even make those opinions the object of their remark. All controversy will be conducted under anonymous signatures.

As to the correspondence, it is believed that, besides its other uses, that department of the Magazine will afford opportunity, if discreetly conducted, for the profitable discussion and explanation of various matters, historical, ecclesiastical, political, and the like, about which individuals may feel interest or perplexity.

In the notices of current literature, it is not contemplated to in-

clude either theological or devotional works : not dogmatic subjects, because they ought to be treated with more reverence and fullness than is possible in a Magazine ; nor devotional, because they appeal to the feelings, tastes, and needs of individual religious minds, which cannot be made the subject of criticism or of science.

The Conductors of the RAMBLER indulge the hope that the zeal and labour expended on it in former years have not been without fruit ; and, under the encouragement thereby given them, they recommend its future to the good prayers of those persons, not few, they trust, nor inconsiderable, who are interested in its well-being.

. *Communications must be addressed, post-paid, to MESSRS. WILLIAMS and NORGATE, 14 Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London, W.C. ; and no Communications can be returned.*

THE RAMBLER.

VOL. VI. *New Series.* JANUARY 1862.

PART XVII.

TOCQUEVILLE'S REMAINS.*

EVERY one who values grace of expression, not varnishing vacuity, but setting off thoughts always sensible and often profound, should read the two volumes of Alexis de Tocqueville's letters. M. Gustave de Beaumont, his intimate friend, and his travelling companion in that American tour which furnished the materials for his classical book on Democracy, has prefixed to the letters a biography, short, and maintaining a high-bred reserve, but telling enough to give a clear picture of the man. It shows us Tocqueville not only as a genius, but as a friend capable of feeling, inspiring, and retaining affections both solid and enthusiastic. It would be delightful to dwell on his social and domestic life, but we feel still greater interest in tracing his ideas. We shall therefore only touch upon his character so far as his qualities as a great writer and thinker were founded upon his qualities as a man.

M. de Beaumont has acted on a different view, and has professed such an exclusive devotion to the person of his departed friend, that he is even jealous of letting us know what Tocqueville thought, unless the thinker had likewise given the last polish to his expression. Like a classical revivalist of the Renaissance, he ranks manner so much above matter, style so much over ideas, that he can even bring himself to smother and suppress the posthumous fragments which might have been such advanced starting-points for the fresh discoverer, because they have not all the graces of style

* Memoir, Letters, and Remains of Alexis de Tocqueville. Translated, with large additions. 2 vols. Macmillan.

which their author would have given them if he had lived to publish them. These two volumes would be enough to show how great a loss M. de Beaumont inflicts upon us if he had not told us what the sacrifice is, and why he has decided to make it. The greatest political philosopher of France spent a life in trying to solve the enigma of the French Revolution:— he painted the background of his picture in his book on the *Ancien Régime et la Révolution*, and the chief figures were nearly filled in when he died :

“ The second volume was far advanced : Tocqueville wanted only a few months more to finish it. The order of the chapters and the sequence of the ideas was arranged from first to last ; some chapters are not mere sketches, they are pictures which have received the artist's last touch ; and even where the outlines are not distinct, they are indicated. By collating these precious materials, arranging them, supplying here a few pages, there a few words, it would no doubt be possible to put this second volume into form, and make it over to the natural curiosity of the public. But who would dare to venture on this experiment, especially considering the importance attached by Tocqueville to publishing nothing which was not as nearly perfect as he was able to make it ? Often in the margin of the Ms. one sees, in the author's hand, these words : ‘ To be reconsidered ; ’ ‘ To be verified. ’ Sometimes a single note of interrogation, set against an opinion, expresses marks of the writer's doubt, and suggests a reconsideration. In the presence of so many signs of scruples and fears, who would venture to be bolder than the author himself ? who would dare to solve the questions raised, to touch the delicate points, to end the unfinished sentences, to graft another style upon his style, and to inflict the faults and responsibilities of another upon his glorious memory ? Such profanation will not be committed. . . . Except a slender portion [two chapters], it is resolved that *nothing* shall *ever* be published.”

It is not that M. de Beaumont doubts of the truth of the thoughts, but he is repelled by the imperfection of their form, so unworthy, he thinks, of Tocqueville's artistic mind. “ Who,” he asks, “ would exhibit in a prolix and diluted state thoughts which he only showed when condensed, and which he would have employed his whole skill to compress ? ” There would have been some point here if Tocqueville only addressed the imagination, not the understanding. In works of imagination and sentiment, style and language are not the dress, but the incarnation of thought, no more to be separated from it than body from soul. But in history and philosophy, style is only the garment, and it is perfect when it enables us to remember the idea without being able to recall the phrase, just as the man is best dressed whose dress is least

noticeable. The gentleman, says Tocqueville, leaves this matter to his tailor. Surely he would have been content to leave the arrangement of his posthumous fragments to his editor. M. de Beaumont's rule would have buried a book in which Tocqueville delighted, the *Pensées* of Pascal; it would have suppressed the extracts which M. de Beaumont (in spite of the author's condemnatory endorsement) prints from Tocqueville's tour in Sicily. Carried into other branches of art, the rule would consign the Athenian fragments of Phidias and the unfinished pictures of Turner to the cellars of the Museum, until the impossible condition of finding an artist competent to restore or complete them was fulfilled. We have no wish to undervalue style and finish; but on the other hand, fragments have also their value, especially such as those of Tocqueville are said to be. In his note-books there are materials for volumes; there are multitudinous extracts from unpublished documents, the discovery of which he counted as half his work; there are notes of travel in Germany and England, which are so many "finished compositions." But he did not print them, so we are never to read them. "If he thought them unworthy, who should venture to publish them, and to offer as finished works what he considered merely as materials for his own use?" Surely, they might be offered as fragments for the use of those who wish to carry on the work that Tocqueville was not allowed to finish.

But M. de Beaumont replies that "Tocqueville could never understand how an author could publish, *unless as a means of adding to his fame.*" Yet there are various kinds of fame. Without adding to his literary renown, his fragments might exhibit him in a new light as a discoverer, a philosopher, or a politician; at any rate they might assist in the search for the useful and the true. M. de Beaumont's feeling on this point seems to be a lingering influence of the old French *salon*, with its tastes for intellectual pleasures, fine literary compositions, and good conversation. This taste gave France the brilliancy and polish which for three hundred years captivated the imagination of Europe, and had thus acquired a practical importance which gave solidity and purpose to a society whose sole apparent object was to amuse and be amused; where politics were seldom talked of, and little thought about; where every new book of any merit was read aloud, and canvassed, and criticised, with an attention and a detail which would now be thought a wretched waste of time; where every considerable country house had its theatre, every family its actors, and where every incident fur-

nished matter for a little poem ; whose arts, now lost, were *causer, raconter, and tenir salon*. From this society Tocqueville inherited his aristocratic taste and pure style, and a squeamishness which M. de Beaumont consecrates into an inviolable rule of literary morality. To those who have no experience of this old French society, the rule will seem too arbitrary, too nearly connected with what Tocqueville somewhere calls "the senile imbecility of worn-out aristocracies, reduced to mere drawing-room coteries, from having had the guidance of men and of affairs," to be worthy of much regard. Tocqueville himself advised his friends to disregard it, as when, in 1844, he rebuked M. de Corcelle for wishing a newspaper-writer to be a perfect gentleman ; and declared that style and tone were relative qualities, that should vary with the purpose of the speaker, and with his audience. In his own reading he tolerated all styles that did not shroud mere barrenness ; he devoured tiresome books if they told him about facts ; and he was so keen a reader of other men's notes of travel, that we can hardly think he would have approved of the reserve which suppresses his own. We cannot find that he was particularly chary of his embryo thoughts, except when he hoped, and expected, to work them up into a book ; and even then he would on occasion publish them, as in that article in the *Westminster Review* of April 1836, which contains the germs of his volume on the *Ancien Régime*, published in 1856. His unfinished second volume on the Revolution must be at least as complete, in all respects but that of style, as this article was. And M. de Beaumont's distinction between the man as the writer of letters, and the author as the writer of books, seems scarcely applicable to Tocqueville's letters, which are often only fragments of his books. Both in his letters and in his books, his charm is more in his thoughts than in his language. What he writes does not merely play round the fancy, but goes direct to that "inner home of thought," where, as St. Augustine says, truth is no longer Greek or Barbarian, but simple truth, in whatever language it is expressed.

We think that M. de Beaumont's pious fussiness about his friend's literary fame is also connected with a low view of the dignity of history, common to most of us, but especially characteristic of France. The French are great historians, and have put history to more practical uses than most men ; yet with them history has hardly yet reached the dignity of a science ; it is too often only a collection of political commonplaces and examples to enforce foregone conclusions. They have studied history, not as scientific inquirers, but as

advocates, and so their historical system is not a reflection of facts, but of party spirit. Every revolution in France is fed by historical traditions. Before the revival of literature, Frenchmen were appealing to history in favour of each rival claim, and were collecting its evidences for each adverse pretension. With them the use of historical remembrances is to excite chimerical projects, to engender new dreams. The memory of 1798, when Egypt was conquered by a French army, and described by a French institute, governed the policy of Louis Philippe towards Mehemet Ali; and the Napoleonic idea is a dream founded on a legend.

"[Our] reading of history," said Tocqueville to Mr. Senior, in 1851, "is our bane. If we could forget the past, we might apply a calm impartial judgment to the present. But we are always thinking of precedents. Sometimes we draw them from our own history, sometimes from yours. Sometimes we use this precedent as an example, sometimes as a warning. But as the circumstances under which we apply it always differ materially from those under which it took place, it almost always misleads us. We indicted Louis for conspiracy against the nation, because you had indicted Charles. We substituted Louis Philippe for Charles X., as you had substituted Mary for James. Louis XVI. believed that Charles I. had lost his crown and his life by raising his standard at Edge Hill, so he tried non-resistance. Charles X. saw that his brother's submission was fatal, and had recourse to the ordinances and to his army. Louis Philippe recollected the fate of Charles X., and forbade his troops to act. Thus the pendulum oscillates, and generally oscillates wrong."

Those who take St. Augustine's view of history, that it is no human institution, but God's handwriting upon the tablets of time,* will look upon its misuse as a kind of sacrilege, like mutilating Scripture, or searching for texts to prop up falsehood or injustice. To postpone historical truth to amenities of style, is to them like contemning St. John's Gospel for its barbarisms of language. Such persons will not dare to make history the handmaid of their own ideas, or to give it a mere rhetorical place among the topics of persuasion, but will regard it as the indelible record of the judgment and will of God. They will come to history as to an oracle, not to impose their own ideas upon it, but to receive its unbiased answer. They will study history as the astronomer studies nature, aiming simply at knowing the truth, not going about to prove their own guesses to be true. When they meet a

* *Narratione autem historica cum præterita etiam hominum instituta narrantur, non inter humana instituta ipsa historia numeranda est; quia jam quæ transierunt, nec infecta fieri possunt, in ordine temporum habenda sunt, quorum est conditor et administrator Deus,*

new fact, they will at once ask how it is proved, and whence it arises, without striving to smother it till they have asked what it proves, and whither it will lead them. They will allow no interest to prevail over their love of truth; they will act towards her with the immovable trust of Alexander, who drank off the cup which his friend presented, though a whisperer told him it was poisoned, to show that he could not misdoubt his friend's honesty. The friend of truth may sometimes be called upon to do like deeds of heroism, to dare danger, or to sacrifice dear delusions for her sake. But then he certainly must not enter on the study of history for the sake of an idea which may possibly turn out to be a delusion, and which will certainly make him wish rather to lead history than to follow it; still less for the mere dilettante pleasure of saying pretty things, or uttering sharp remarks.

In old days, all important truths were supposed to be got at either by meditation on first principles or by revelation; history only showed how imperfectly these truths were realised in practice. History, therefore, had to be revised before it could really serve as an example. Facts fell short of the ideal; and the historian who wished to be didactic was obliged to draw on his fancy like the modern novelist. When the historian Varillas was advised that a fact had not happened as he told it, "So much the worse for the fact," he said; "it is much better as it stands in my story." Hence arose an utter carelessness about evidence. "Better believe it than go about to see whether it is true," was a proverb that expressed the current theory of historiography. Vertot received from a friend some documents about a siege; he found he could not use them without rewriting his story, so he sent them back with thanks, saying that his siege was done. These were absurd exaggerations of a practice of which lesser examples may be found in almost every page of Rohrbacher's history, who writes, not to find out what the truth was, but to use what he hopes was the truth for party purposes, to consolidate a preconceived theory. Michaud's History of the Crusades is an uncritical patchwork of the original annals and legends, embroidered with the fancies of Torquato Tasso. Capefigue's history of those wars, in his work on the French kings, promises indeed new views, but is made up of foregone conclusions, occasionally, but only accidentally, verging upon the truth. He hits upon a general idea, an *idée mère*, and out of it he gets a perfect melodrama of deeds, persons, and opinions, of which there is about one true in a hundred false. If such writers know that history is a Divine lesson, they are too impatient to wait for its teaching till the real historical

truth is ascertained, but snatch right and left the first facts or views that suit their purpose, and then fashion them, with dangerous skill, into a specious argument, good for some momentary purpose, but of no value for ascertaining what will be the final award of historical truth. Even so beautiful a book as Montalembert's *Monks of the West*, in spite of the excellence of its execution, fails, for the like fault of design, to attain the dignity of history.

If we believe M. de Beaumont, Tocqueville was a historian of this kind. He never was a man who loved knowledge for its own sake, or who was enthusiastically attached to ideas and theories independently of their application; on the contrary, his speculations had always a practical and definite object; abstract thought was out of his sphere; in all his speculations he considered the past only as it affected the present, and foreign countries only with a view to his own. He describes America with a perpetual silent reference to France, and the French Revolution of 1790 with an eye to the actual state of the country and to the events of his own day. His letters partly confirm this description of the memoir. His enthusiasm for the present left so little room for the past, that he could take no interest in ancient Greek history till Mr. Grote showed him how it could be explained to modern ideas, and be made to speak the language of modern political passions. Aristotle would not conform kindly to this adaptation, and was slighted. Plato was loved not for his metaphysics, which were puerile and antiquated, but for his spirituality, which was as youthful as ever. Tocqueville was quite ignorant of many branches of history—among others, of Christian antiquities: in one of his latest letters he has the simplicity to thank Mr. Reeve for the pleasure he had derived from the superficial article on the Roman Catacombs in the *Edinburgh Review* of January 1859. With such gaps in its horizon, his historical knowledge could never be the touchstone or source of his ideas, but only their instrument or their channel. Properly speaking, he was no historian, though he wrote the best book on a great historical event; his horizon was not wide enough to see things in their whole course from beginning to end, in their flow,—*im Werden*, as the Germans say; but within his limits he was a marvellous observer of every fact that was actually to be found there—of every constant element of the combination he wished to analyse.

He was not inspired by the spirit which works the progress of history; but his ideas welled up within his own soul, and owed their origin partly to his education, but chiefly to his personal character—to a conflict of heart and brain, which

determined both his practice and his philosophy. "Naturally," says his biographer, "he was strongly inclined to be a dreamer; and it was never but by an effort of will that he roused himself from passive impression to active thought." But as his reverie was always gloomy and melancholy, he always fled from it. The central point of stillness in his soul, instead of being a cosy corner inviting him to rest, was a bleak, frozen spot, where he found nothing but doubt, fear, and despondency, the only remedy for which was in the energy of a courageous will. Thus his activity was centrifugal—an effort to escape from that gloomy, melancholy pride, which, agued by fear, might have degenerated into insanity or anarchy of soul, but which, when repressed with unflagging bravery, became the occasion, if not the root, of his greatness.

"One of my firmest opinions," he says, "is, that life has no period of rest; that external, and still more internal, exertion is as necessary in age as in youth—nay, even more necessary. Man is a traveller towards a colder and colder region; and the higher his latitude, the faster ought to be his walk. The great malady of the soul is cold. It must be combated by activity and exertion, by contact with one's fellow creatures and with the business of the world" (vol. i. p. 375). "The only virtue that I really value in man is energy" (vol. i. p. 438). "I love those [human passions] that are good, and I am not quite sure that I hate the bad. They always show strength; and strength, wherever you meet with it, appears with advantage by the side of the weakness which surrounds us" (vol. ii. p. 68).

His energy was thus an internal necessity, not of self-contemplation, which would have made him a metaphysician, but of escaping from a dismal centre of doubt and gloom. This made him a politician, and taught him to regard freedom, which is only the natural atmosphere of energy, as the great remedy for all the ills of man. His life was a worship of liberty, begun in enthusiastic youth, and increasing in fervour throughout a serious manhood; begun, perhaps, in a time of religious indifference, but solemnly ratified after he came to recognise more profoundly the need of an eternal foundation as the solid basis on which life ought to rest; so that when, late in his life, he reviewed his career, he consoled himself with the thought, that if he had to live it over again, he should have no change to make in the bulk of his ideas, sentiments, and actions. "I do not choose," he wrote, in 1836, "to be confounded with those friends of order who are indifferent to freedom and justice, provided they can sleep quietly in their beds" (vol. i. p. 401). And to Madame Swetchine, in 1856: "I still consider liberty as the first of

blessings; I still see that it is one of the most fertile sources of manly virtues and great actions. No tranquillity and no material comfort can, in my mind, make up for its loss" (vol. ii. p. 320). Liberty, then, was the original *datum* of his philosophy, and the starting-point of all his energies; and when he viewed the circumstances of his time, and saw, on one hand, the cloud of democracy looming all round the horizon, and, on the other, the growing discord between religiousness and liberty, he saw at once that the two great problems of the day were, how to reconcile freedom with these two great and inevitable forces that were apparently hostile to it. "To show men how in a democracy they may avoid submitting to tyranny or sinking into imbecility, is a sacred calling, in which one must grudge neither one's money, one's time, nor one's life" (vol. i. p. 330). "My object is, to persuade men that respect for law, both human and divine, is the best way to be free; and that to grant freedom is the best way to insure morality and religion" (vol. i. p. 403). It was to the solution of the first of these problems, the harmony of freedom and democracy, that he principally devoted his literary and political career, but not without bestowing much incidental attention on the second. But his reputation will not be founded on his method of reconciling religion with freedom; he did not understand the Church, as is plain to every reader of his chapter on the old French clergy, in his *Ancien Régime*: their powerlessness was a mystery to him; he forgets their religious deficiencies while fixing his eyes on their political and social excellence; he scarcely notices that they were eaten up with Jansenism, utterly helpless against the literary unbelief, and profoundly divided among themselves. The problem of harmonising democracy with freedom sent him to America, but no more for the object of giving Frenchmen a true account of the American constitution than Solomon sent the sluggard to the ant for the purpose of studying its natural history. It is by supererogation that his picture of American institutions is so accurate. In them he thought he had found the lesson that France required, so it fell in with his design to paint America as it was; if American democracy had seemed to teach a different lesson, he was too great an observer to have falsified the picture, but he would have let America alone, and either given up his task in despair or sought another mine of examples to illustrate his doctrines. He not only wrote his book, but he investigated with a particular object; and if his investigations had not appeared to confirm his theories, he would have given up, not his theories, but his investigations. The physical phi-

losopher also interrogates nature on an hypothesis, but he is ready to give up his hypothesis if facts refuse to confirm it. No such consideration would have made Tocqueville give up the idea which was the political object of his book. He would have thrown down his pen, as M. de Beaumont says, but he would have retained his belief.

"I wished to show what in our days a democratic people really was ; and by a rigorously accurate picture to produce a double effect on the men of my day. To those who have fancied an ideal democracy, a brilliant and easily realised dream, I endeavoured to show that they had clothed the picture in false colours ; that the republican government which they extol, even though it may bestow substantial benefits on a people that can bear it, has none of the elevated features with which their imagination would endow it ; and, moreover, that such a government cannot be maintained without certain conditions of intelligence, of private morality, and of religious belief, that we as a nation have not reached, and that we must labour to attain before grasping their political results.

To those for whom the word democracy is synonymous with destruction, anarchy, spoliation, and murder, I have tried to show that under a democratic government the fortunes and the rights of society may be respected, liberty preserved, and religion honoured ; that though a republic may develop less than other governments some of the noblest powers of the human mind, it yet has a nobility of its own ; and that, after all, it may be God's will to spread a moderate amount of happiness over all men, instead of heaping a large sum upon a few, by allowing only a small minority to approach perfection. I attempted to prove to them that, whatever their opinions might be, deliberation was no longer in their power ; that society was tending every day more and more towards equality, and dragging them and every one else along with it ; that the only choice lay between two inevitable evils ; that the question had ceased to be whether they would have an aristocracy or a democracy, and now lay between a democracy without poetry or elevation indeed, but with order and morality ; and an undisciplined and depraved democracy, subject either to sudden frenzies, or to a yoke heavier than has galled mankind since the fall of the Roman Empire.

I wished to diminish the ardour of the republican party, and without disheartening them, to point out their only wise course.

I have endeavoured to abate the claims of the aristocrats, and to make them bend to an irresistible future ; so that the impulse in one quarter and resistance in the other being less violent, society may march on peaceably towards the fulfilment of its destiny. This is the dominant idea in the book, an idea which embraces all the others."

His melancholy helped him to his fixed idea of the predestined dominion of democracy, and led him into the delusion

that it tends irresistibly to predominate throughout all history, instead of being only one of several elements in the State, an element which had no place at all in early and undeveloped societies, which the Revolution endeavours to make sole and supreme, and which it is the problem of all time to raise to its proper level and proportion. But it was his energy, his indomitable will, that predetermined him to the conclusion, that liberty must be compatible with democracy, and that forced him to show how the two could be reconciled; if facts were there to prove his conclusion, so much the better; but he would have proved it no less, though America had not been at hand with its ready-made instances for his induction, and though he had foreseen that the United States would fail in solving the problem of reconciling democracy and freedom, by failing to reconcile power with law, the popular will with the duty of the people. Thus his qualities as a writer were based upon his qualities as a man; and, as might be expected in such a person, he soon proved that he was not a mere thinker or publicist, but a man of action, using the press as his instrument.

From 1839 to December 1851, Tocqueville took an active part in the government of France. As deputy, he was in opposition to Louis Philippe's government; but he never accused himself, as Montalembert did, of having thereby contributed to its fall, or to the revolution of 1848, so disastrous to liberty. He was not one of those who, when France was on the high road to happiness, tugged away to make her take a short cut, and so upset the coach; nor, to use a phrase of his own, was he in such a hurry to get to the bottom, that he made her jump out of a window when she was half way down stairs. But after the disaster, he accepted the Republic as the last anchor of liberty, and as the opportunity for putting in practice the speculations of his "Democracy." In July 1849, he became Foreign Secretary under the President; but was turned out the next October, partly through the general policy, which, by dismissing ministry after ministry, made them mere clerks of the President, who thus became his own minister; partly because Tocqueville and his fellows seemed only too successful in proving the compatibility of the Republic with order and good government, and in making it respectable. The usurpation of December 2, 1851, sent him to prison for a few days, and then into private life, almost despairing of his countrymen, whose extreme fear of socialism made them sacrifice liberty to buy the protection of "the saviour of society." He had written and he had worked to prove liberty and the Republic to be compatible; but

Frenchmen would not believe him. *Curavimus Babylonem*, he might say, *et non est sanata*; *dereliquamus eam, et eamus unusquisque in terram suam*. From this time he despaired of the French masses till a radical moral change should be wrought in them; he stood aloof, and retained scarcely any opinion in common with his contemporaries. "I still love passionately," he wrote, in 1853, "the things to which they have become indifferent, and I have an antipathy which grows stronger and stronger for the things which seem to please them more and more. The whole race seems to have altered: I am like one belonging to the old in the midst of the new."

In this enforced seclusion from affairs, his old gloom returned, deepened by his distress at the aspect of politics. Literature was once more his resource to divert his thoughts from the melancholy that oppressed him. He still devoted his pen to the cause of freedom, and looked about for a subject on which he could write with service to it. This was not so easy now as in 1835. France in ceasing to be free had ceased to be literary, and the classes that still read had no power. He could no longer hope for any immediate political effect from his book; but since ideas ultimately prevail in the most illiterate nations, he thought it might be useful to disseminate them; at least he might draw the attention of the civilised world to himself, and thus indirectly benefit his cause. The subject he at last chose was one that suited this frame of mind, and his treatment of it was almost as penitential as his *Démocratie* had been hopeful. It was a kind of national examination of conscience, to find out why the French Revolution, which had promised so much for liberty in 1789, had, at each successive trial, proved to be more akin to anarchy or despotism than to freedom. He examined it in its causes, in the tendencies which led to it, and in its future consequences; he wished to show how that great event advanced, what was its true character, what were the principal causes which led it in one direction more than in another, which drove it on, which turned it aside, and which stopped it. His object was not to point out the remedy for the evils of France, but only to trace how they had arisen.

"It was not my intention to suggest a remedy for the state into which the *Ancien Régime*, the Republic, and the Empire have thrown our country; . . . my fixed resolution is to stop before I set foot on this ground, to consider it only from afar, and not to try to write a book of temporary interest. But it by no means follows that no clear results are to be drawn from the historical

study on which I am at work—that it is to give only a vague notion of the opinions and sentiments of the author, and to leave the reader uncertain as to the judgments which he ought to form upon facts and upon men; on the events themselves, on their causes, and as to the lessons which they teach us. It would be strange, considering that I enter upon this work with decided and often enthusiastic preferences, fixed opinions, and a clear and certain object, if I should leave the reader to float rudderless on the sea of my ideas and of his own” (vol. ii. p. 236).

He knew that it was one thing to write history, another to apply it, and that the application should be separated from the making. If history is a teacher, then true history teaches truth, and false history, falsehood; the first requisite, then, is to find historical truth, the next, to apply it. The two cannot go together; for the interests of the application must always be stronger than those of truth, and must tend not to make us rule our judgments by history, but warp history to our judgments. Those who could overcome the temptation could never overcome the suspicion of having yielded; at the best they would countenance the notion that history held but a lower place, and was fit only to strengthen or confute, not to originate or govern, our ideas. Tocqueville, in approaching his historical studies with “decided and enthusiastic preferences, fixed opinions, and a clear and certain object,” was setting a bad example to succeeding historians; not all preferences are so simple, so pure, and so true as his; and even if they were, few men would have patience to make themselves learned like him, but, failing this, could easily become dogmatic and positive. Even if they imitated his moderation, we might easily suspect it to be make-believe, and their fairness to be only a skilful partiality. Besides his political objects, he had in all his writings a literary one—to be original; and that in a way which does not combine well with the scope of the historian, which is to give not the most original, but the most probable, view of the causes and the succession of events. Tocqueville hoped to do so, but on one condition—that the most probable view should be his own.

“When I have a subject to treat, it is almost impossible for me to read what has been already written on it: the contact of the ideas of other men disturbs and affects me painfully. I try, therefore, to avoid knowing the explanations which other writers have given of the facts which I have to relate, or the inferences which they have drawn from them. I make the utmost efforts to ascertain, from contemporary evidence, what really happened; and often spend great labour in discovering what was ready to my

hand. When I have gathered-in this toilsome harvest, I retire, as it were, into myself; I examine with extreme care, collate, and connect the notions which I have acquired, and I make it a rule to give the result, without bestowing a thought on the inferences which others may draw from what I write. Not that I am indifferent to the opinions of my readers; but because I know from experience that if I were to write with a purpose, in order to support some preconceived system, I should write ill; that my only means of writing well is to state clearly my own personal impressions and opinions" (vol. ii. p. 339).

Tocqueville had no respect for the art which out of three bad books compiles a fourth; and agreed with Drusius that secondhand knowledge is poor capital—*miserè sapit qui tantum ex commentario sapit*. But this does not mean that the original investigator should read no commentaries, or should remain in ignorance of all previous theories on the origin and connexion of the facts he describes. Originality is the badge of the inventor of systems, not of the apostle of truth. There is an old complaint against philosophy, that *leges naturæ opiniones suas fecit*,—once she made her own opinions into laws of nature; now her temptation is to make the laws of nature into private opinions, severally ticketed as the peculiar property of this or that thinker, by right of "originality." Yet the most original writers depend more on memory than they would willingly allow; they all keep a pawnshop in their heads, though, perhaps, the pawns have lost their tickets, and have come to belong, with seeming right, to the actual possessor. Tocqueville, according to M. de Beaumont, even as a politician in the Chambers, would say nothing, however true, unless it was also new; he was not content to persuade, unless he could by the same act add to his literary fame; thus the artist in him strove with the politician and the historian, and somewhat marred his completeness. The feeling, however, was connected with a noble delicacy of mind, which made him at once suppress what he destined for publication when he feared it might interfere with any work of his friends; it was not a coarse love of reputation which moved him, but a refined craving for sympathy. Perhaps he rather exaggerated to himself his own worship of originality; at any rate his note-books contain evidence of "his profound study of every theory connected with" the French Revolution.* Perhaps the feeling was rather a pa-

* *Research* should be original; but a man who refuses to know what others have said before him either goes wrong, or ends by saying what others have said, without knowing it. Judge Story complains that Tocqueville, in his *America*, knowingly says much that others had said before him, and that without acknowledgment. Of his other work, the leading ideas and many

trician affectation, a lingering influence from the literary drawing-rooms of the old aristocracy, than a rule of conduct. It was, however, one of those obvious features which the imitators of great men so easily copy and so surely caricature. M. de Beaumont has caught the infection in a virulent form, and seems to consider it a great part of a great writer's duty to wish to say what he hopes has never been said before.

Our quotations thus far have been chosen with reference to two points,—Tocqueville's method, and his solution of the problem, how to harmonise the power of the masses with liberty: the rest of our quotations will refer to his ideas upon the harmony of religion and liberty. Into this discussion he also entered with fixed notions; he assumed the truth that religion is perfect freedom at least in the individual soul, and therefore that it ought to thrive best in an atmosphere of social and political freedom. Religion and freedom ought to play into each other's hand, "both have in view universal, and on the whole immaterial, blessings; both aim at a certain ideal perfection of the human race, the contemplation of which lifts the mind above the consideration of petty personal interests" (vol. i. p. 360). Religious and political fervour may unite in the same heart, but not the love of liberty and of material comfort; besides, "free institutions are often the natural, and sometimes the indispensable, instruments of religious enthusiasm. Almost every effort made by the moderns towards liberty has been occasioned by the desire to manifest or to defend their religious convictions" (ib.).

But if religion and freedom are thus friendly forces,

"How is it," he asks, "that the Christian religion, which has in so many respects improved individuals and advanced our race, has exercised, especially in the beginning, so little influence over the progress of society? Why is it that, in proportion as men become more humane, more just, more temperate, more chaste, they seem every day more and more indifferent to public virtue; so much so, that the great family of the nation seems more corrupt, more base, and more tottering, while every little individual family is better regulated? . . . This contrast, which strikes us from the beginning of Christianity, between Christian virtues and public virtue, has frequently reappeared. There is nothing which seems so difficult of explanation, when we consider that God, and after Him, His revelation, are the foundations, or rather the sources, of all virtues, the practice of which is necessary in the different states

of the facts had been anticipated in Heinrich von Sybel's *Introduction to the History of the Revolutionary Period*, the first volume of which was printed at Düsseldorf in 1853. But many of these ideas had been published by Tocqueville in his article in the *Westminster Review* in 1836.

of mankind. This great question ought to be solved" (vol. ii. p. 332).

He considers that this contrast is painfully apparent now. Morality, he says, is divisible into two portions, both equally important in the eyes of God, but not both taught with equal energy by His ministers. One respects private life—the duties of mankind as fathers, children, husbands, and wives. The other respects public life—the duties of every citizen to his country. The clergy, he thinks, care much about the first branch of morality and little about the second, as is clear by the way that women think and feel, who have all personal and domestic virtues,* without a notion of public virtues. He wishes the clergy to instil into the souls of the people that every one belongs much more to his country than to himself; that no one ought to be indifferent towards it, much less, by treating such indifference as a sort of languid virtue, to enervate many of our noblest instincts; that every one is responsible for its fortunes, and is bound to work out its prosperity, and to watch that it be not governed except by respectable, beneficent, and legitimate authorities (vol. ii. pp. 344, 350).

Such was Tocqueville's view of the duties of religion and its ministers towards political freedom. Let us now pass to his views on the manner in which they fulfilled that duty. In vol. ii. p. 9 is a letter to Lord Radnor, reviewing the conduct of the French clergy after Napoleon had reduced them from proprietors to pensioners of the state, and had destroyed the intermediate tribunal which formerly existed between the bishops and the inferior clergy, in hopes that when the latter were subject to the uncontrolled jurisdiction of their prelates, he might easily manage a few bishops, and so become master of all their inferiors. At the Restoration, the clergy remained in the same legal condition :

* To Mr. Senior, Tocqueville did not speak in such complimentary terms of the French women as to Madame Swetchine. The French women, he complained, who under the old monarchy used to encourage their sons to masculine virtues, and who under a despotism ought to have most influence, have lost it all, partly through the vulgarity of the men's passions, partly through their own nullity; they are all built and furnished on exactly the same uninteresting model. Whether she is brought up at home or in a convent, a French girl has the same masters, gets a smattering of the same accomplishments, reads the same dull books, and contributes to society the same little contingent of superficial information; she is simple, pious, retiring, till she marries; then in three months she is one of the fashionable congregation at the one o'clock Mass. In old times a girl came from the convent a sheet of white paper; she caught knowledge and tact and expression from society, with the sagacity, curiosity, and flexibility of French women; now her mind is a paper scribbled over with trash (vol. ii. p. 431).

"But they were allowed an indirect share in the government. The parish-priest, from the weight given to his recommendations, became a sort of political authority. Places were given with more regard to religious opinions than to capacity. . . . The union between Church and State became more and more evident. . . . The archbishops and some of the bishops obtained seats in the House of Peers. The nation was governed, or thought it was governed, by the priests; their influence was felt every where. Then re-appeared what we call in France the Voltairian spirit; the spirit of systematic hostility and sarcasm, directed not only against the ministers of religion, but against religion itself. . . . Under the Empire, the Church took no part in politics; after the Restoration, it became a political party in itself. It joined the most ardent votaries of absolute monarchy, and often declaimed from the pulpit in its favour.

The result was fatal. Almost all the liberal party, that is, the great majority of the nation, became irreligious on political grounds. Impiety was a form of opposition. Excellent men were furious when religion was mentioned; others, notoriously immoral, talked of restoring altars, and of inculcating reverence towards God."

This alliance of the elder branch of the Bourbons with the clergy cost the family its throne, and the Church its popularity. In some of the larger towns, the clergy in 1830 were obliged to disguise themselves; and the Archbishop of Paris, after the burning and pillage of his palace, was forced to hide himself. The new government recognised the Church no longer as the religion of the State, but only as the "religion of the majority," and the priests lost every species of indirect political influence. The consequences were soon manifest.

"As soon as the clergy lost their political power, and it was perceived that they were more liable to be persecuted than favoured by the government, the animosity which had pursued them began to diminish, though not all at once nor every where; . . . the reaction which was to bend the public mind in the direction of religion had already begun. . . . Most of the liberals, whose irreligious opinions formerly placed them foremost in the ranks of the opposition, now hold a different language. All acknowledge the political utility of religion, and deplore the general want of faith; but the greatest change is observable among the young men. Since religion has been separated from politics, a faith, vague as to its objects, but powerful in its effects, is developing itself among them. The necessity of a religion is a frequent theme of their conversation. Many believe; all would like to believe. This feeling makes them crowd into the churches whenever there is a celebrated preacher."

This was written in 1835. It is not inconsistent with Tocqueville's complaints of twenty years later, about the clergy never inculcating the public and political duties of morality. What he blamed them for in 1835 was taking the absolutist side—making themselves a political party; what he blamed them for in 1855 was not for abstaining from taking part either with the Republicans or Royalists, but for neglecting to instil the love of public virtue into their flocks. Still he seems in 1835 to have had a feeling against “political parsons,” as the Americans call them, which he no longer entertained after he had studied the great and honourable part played by the French clergy under the *ancien régime*. In 1843 he wrote to M. de Corcelle, who appears to have been his Mentor in ecclesiastical politics, to express his regret that the clergy had abandoned the path they followed with such success in 1830.

“One of my dreams, my chief dream when I entered public life, was to endeavour to reconcile the liberal party to the religious party; modern society to the Church. This reconciliation, essential both to liberty and to public morality, is now difficult; their relative positions, which, immediately after the revolution of July, were uncertain, are now fixed; and it would take years to bring us back to where we were three years ago. . . . I am filled with regret, and also with irritation, against the authors of all this evil. I am angry with the vanity and passions of some of the opponents of the clergy; but I own that I am also indignant against the other party. When I think of the state of public opinion and of the press, scarcely three years ago, in religious matters, and of what it now is, I cannot avoid seeing that the clergy must have been guilty of enormous errors. Violent personal abuse and exaggerated accusations have injured an excellent cause. Instead of supporting for others, and claiming for themselves, the right of teaching, they have exhibited a desire to influence, if not to direct, all popular education.”

The clergy, he says, cannot have a monopoly of any kind of freedom; they must share the same rights that others enjoy. If they wish liberty of teaching for themselves, they must claim it for others also. He clearly thought that the line taken by the *Univers* and its powerful faction, in the debates upon education, was fatal to the harmony of religion and freedom. But whatever errors the clergy had made in their relations with the liberal party, the revolution of February 1848 gave an unexpected opportunity of correcting. The new state of things was at first decidedly in favour of the Church. There was a general reaction in favour of religion, till the greater part of the clergy committed the gross

error of supposing that this reaction depended on a single man, and so sacrificed liberty to their particular interest in promoting him to the supreme power. However the results of this step may have disappointed those who took it, they would have caused no surprise to the man who wrote thus to M. de Corcelle, in September 1851.

"The reaction in favour of belief, and of those who profess to be believers, which we have witnessed since the Republic, can have astonished only those who do not reflect. It has not depended, and will not depend, on the influence of any one man, or even of any particular government; for the most striking characteristic of the times is the powerlessness both of men and of governments to direct the course of social or political changes. This reaction has two principal causes: 1. The fear of socialism, which, for the time being, has produced on the middle classes an effect similar to that which the French Revolution formerly produced upon the upper ranks. 2. The having placed the government in the hands of the masses, which, for the moment at least, has restored to the Church and to the landlords an influence which they have not enjoyed for sixty years, and which, in fact, even sixty years ago they had ceased to possess; for at that time their influence was merely a light reflected from that of the government—now they receive it from the spontaneous feelings of the people. As long as these two great causes prevail, the effect which we rejoice in will continue, unless enormous blunders are committed by the clergy, and still more by their friends.

My opinion, which, unfortunately, is not that of most of our religious men, is that no government of any description can ever propagate religion in France. They who are so clamorous for the despotic interference of the government in these matters, or even for any considerable interference on its part, commit a serious error. A strong and absolute government may interfere in other things with advantage, but not in this. Of this I am as sure as it is possible to be. . . . Whoever may be elected President, no serious or lasting religious reaction will ever take place, except as the result of the inward working of society left to itself. It will spring from individual experience of the necessity of a faith, of the daily need of it and of its special ministers, felt by all, either to remedy the moral evils of the age, or to resist its political diseases. The direct action of the government, instead of forwarding, will only impede this movement."

The clergy committed the usual French fault of considering only the formal distribution of power without minding its moral basis; the support which, on this view, they gave to the usurper of the 2d of December, though it proved Tocqueville to be a true prophet, nevertheless filled him with the bitterest grief, almost with despair (vol. ii.

p. 238). In contrast with the conduct of the French clergy, he admired that of the Germans, of whom he wrote to Corcelle, from Bonn, in 1854.

"I hear on all sides that there is a revival of religious feeling in all the different forms professed by Germany. I am intimate here with some of the Catholic professors: they affirm that Catholicism exhibits more vitality than it has done for the last hundred years; and this they attribute to the liberty which, in spite of some petty annoyances, it substantially enjoys; and above all, to its separation from the State—a separation all the more complete in that the sovereign is a Protestant. The most eminent of these professors said to me the other day, 'The French clergy seem to me to be entering upon a dangerous path, one which fills us with anxiety. How is it that they do not see that in these days we derive our strength from independence of the temporal power, and not from the always precarious, often dangerous, always invidious, support of that power? Let your priests visit us, and they will see how we congratulate ourselves on our condition. Now, when abandoned to itself, and assisted only by freedom, Catholicism has regained its vigour. I assure you,' he added, 'that if I could at once incline the temporal power in our favour, and destroy the rivalry of the Protestants, I should, in the interest of our religion, refuse to do so'" (vol. ii. p. 271).

England in 1857 presented to his eyes a still more consoling spectacle than Germany in 1854:

"I enjoyed in England what I have long been deprived of—a union between the religious and the political world, between public and private virtue, between religion and liberty. I heard the members of every denomination advocate free institutions, as necessary not only to the welfare, but to the morality of society. Never on any occasion did I see what prevails on the Continent; the moral monstrosity of pious men applauding despotism, leaving to infidels the cause of liberty."

M. de Corcelle hereupon reproached him with disparaging Catholics in comparison with Protestants. Tocqueville replied, that his phrase "Christians of all denominations" was meant to include Catholics.

"In fact I never met with an English Catholic, who did not value, as much as any Protestant, the free institutions of his country, or who divided morality into two sections, one consisting of public virtues, which may be safely neglected, the other of private duties, which alone need be observed. No Catholic, lay or clerical, thought this. I did not compare the religions, but the countries. I said only that I breathed freely in a country where liberty and religion were united. And I said truly; for from my youth the spectacle of their disunion has oppressed my soul. I said this more than twenty years ago in the introduction to my *Dé-*

mocratie. I feel it now as I did in youth. It is the thought most constantly in my mind."

After declaring that the French liberals console themselves for the loss of liberty by boasting their unlimited license of attacking the Church, he asks :

"What do our clergy, who delight in political neutrality and apathy, say to this? I venture to predict that in our days it will not be found safe to withdraw the human mind from political action. As soon as it ceases to act, it theorises most dangerously. The German school, pretending not to care for politics, so undermined the foundations of society, that all the German governments, unsupported by principles or habits capable of resistance, fell at one moment and under one blow."

These extracts show that, however clearly Tocqueville stated the problem of religion and liberty, he did little to solve it; indeed it can be only solved practically by the conduct of religious men themselves, just as the problem of democracy and liberty can be only solved by the masses. Perhaps his most instructive fragment on the practical solution of the problem is his conversation with Senior in 1851, concerning the French intervention at Rome in 1849, which he, as Foreign Minister, had to conduct.

There were three motives for this intervention: the maintenance of French influence in Italy, the restoration of the Pope, and the introduction of liberal institutions into Rome. The first object was not attained so entirely as it might have been, if the Romans had known the sacrifices which France made in order not to injure their historical monuments.

"The Cardinals at Gaeta during the siege were always contrasting our slow proceedings with the vigour with which the Austrians reduced Bologna. They did not, in so many words, require us to bombard Rome; but to obey them, and bring the siege to an end rapidly, that is what we must have done. If any other of the Catholic powers* had undertaken to settle the Roman affair, the town would have been reduced in a week, by destroying, perhaps, a third of it. From the time that Oudinot entered Rome in July, till we were turned out of office at the end of October, the whole object of my correspondence was to induce the Pope to grant liberal institutions to his people. I considered this as the most important of the three objects of the expedition."

The right to demand this of the Pope is grounded on the general right of all powers who restore a dispossessed

* Tocqueville was wrong here. If the Austrians had marched on Rome, there would have been no regular defence: the Roman Republicans resisted the French republican arms because they relied on a disturbance in Paris.

sovereign to demand a security against new revolutions ; they cannot be expected to keep up a permanent police, or to live under the continual risk of having to bear the cost of a new intervention. And this security ought, in the interests of the subjects to whom the sovereign is restored, to consist in liberal institutions ; they have a right to demand of the restoring powers that the restoration shall be conditional upon the establishment and continuance of good government. No one has a right to impose upon a people a particular *régime* in the interests of his religion, or of his belief in legitimacy, unless he also guarantees them their freedom in their own interests. The greater the external guarantee of stability enjoyed by the sovereign, the greater should also be the external guarantee of liberty enjoyed by the people. Hence Tocqueville, in demanding the submission of the Romans to the Pope, rightly also demanded of the Pope certain concessions in their favour. He founded his right against the Roman people

“ on the ground that France is the first Catholic power ; that the spiritual authority of the Pope is essential to the welfare of the Catholic world ; and that some degree of temporal power is necessary for the permanent exercise of his spiritual power. On these grounds, what *appear* to be the domestic affairs of Rome, and *would* be its affairs if the Pope was at Avignon, have always been a matter in which the rest of Europe, Protestant as well as Catholic, has thought itself justified in interfering.”

The concessions demanded by Tocqueville were five : 1. a renewed recognition of the principle of liberty and security ; 2. a new organisation of the Roman courts of justice ; 3. a civil code, resembling that of Piedmont, or of Naples ; 4. elective municipal councils, having power not only to advise, but to legislate in matters of taxation ; 5. the secularisation of the public administration.

“ Of these five requisitions, the two last were of course the most material. As respects the Roman people, the substitution of a lay for a clerical administration was the most urgent of all the reforms. Their hatred against their ecclesiastical rulers is indescribable. It is such that the Pope can retain them only while his capital is occupied by foreign troops ; the instant that we go, unless the Austrians take our place, there will be a new revolution, which will sweep away every clerical functionary. I believe that when we made these demands, many of them were hopeless ; though I thought it my duty to urge all of them as earnestly as if I expected to gain my point.

One of the grounds on which the President dismissed us was our not obtaining greater concessions from the Pope ; but directly

we were gone, he himself, or at least his ministers, gave up every thing. His vanity was satisfied with having insulted the Pope by his letter to Ney, and with having insulted the Chamber by turning out a ministry without consulting it; and his interest in the affairs of Rome was then over.

If the Pope had continued obstinate, we should have refused to sanction by our presence what we could not prevent. My intention was, in that event, to draw up a protest, stating all that we had asked on behalf of the Roman people; the grounds on which we had asked it; and the manner in which it had been refused or eluded; to present it to the Pope, to publish it in the *Moniteur*; and to withdraw our troops from Rome, leaving this appeal to Europe and to posterity."

We have seen Tocqueville, like a genuine Frenchman, to whom the *moi* is always supreme, entering upon his studies, not for the sake of science, but for his own sake; and therefore always displaying a character which remembered personal dignity before it remembered the interests of truth. Hence his worship of style and of originality—not only of that true originality, that spontaneous flow of artistic creation, as different from the artificial affectation of having something to say, as is the endeavour to be eminent among the able, which makes a man a public benefactor, from the plotting to be the only figure among ciphers—but of that false originality which is a mere affectation of novelty, which disdains the true unless it is also new, and which ends by leading a man either to say what is false, or simply to repeat, without knowledge or acknowledgment, what his predecessors have said before him. We have seen him preserved from falsehood, not only by his sense of honour and his conscience, but by his wonderful powers of observation, which were far beyond his powers of reasoning. It was this power of observation which made him so sure a prophet of what was impending, while he was so uncertain in his speculations upon a more distant future; his letters furnish many instances similar to his famous prophecy of the revolution of February 1848, which he made in January. And they furnish also instances analogous to the great delusion of his book on America, which is, his belief that throughout all history democracy has manifested an irresistible tendency towards a predestinated predominance. Thus, with a true patrician hatred of republicanism, he nevertheless adopted it as a fatalistic creed, and resolutely set himself to love, not republicanism as it confronted him in France, but an ideal republicanism which he thought he found over the Atlantic, where distance lent to the view an enchantment which a year's scamper over the United

States was not enough to dispel. Thus his very love for democracy separated him from the French democrats, who, in their profession of freedom, only exaggerate the worst evils of the old *régime*—the absolutism of the State and the absence of self-government. Forced, almost against his will, by a mistake arising from a scanty historical induction, to adopt a false creed, he tried to be its reformer, and was naturally treated by its real followers as a heretic; for his explanation of his political belief was a mere protest against all that inspires its holders in all the Latin countries of modern Europe. So far from democracy being the sole element in the State, as the Revolution would have it to be, in history it does not show itself even as the predominant element. Here is one of Tocqueville's errors. Another is, that in his pedigree of freedom he not only omits one of the factors, but he inverts the order of succession. Of the three great factors of freedom,—the corporation, the state, and the individual,—he omits the first entirely, and treats corporate freedom sometimes as political, sometimes as personal; and instead of making freedom the last blossom and fruit of the harmony of corporate, political, and individual liberty, he makes personal freedom the original *datum*,—the centre from which all political movement originated, instead of the result and the aim to which it tends.

And here we must take our leave of Tocqueville; for the longer we go on, the more there remains to say. The multitudinous subjects which he introduces, his boldness and breadth of view in discussing them, and the suggestive value of his thoughts, open up to the reader of his letters new paths and new horizons at every step.

THE COMMISSION ON EDUCATION, AND THE REVISED CODE.

THE elaborate inquiry of the Royal Commission on Education resulted in a series of recommendations, covering the whole field of elementary instruction, from the great charitable societies of the country to ragged, industrial, and reformatory schools. Neither were the schools maintained by the State for the army and navy, nor the parliamentary system of half-time in factories and print-works, passed unnoticed; but it was to schools for the independent poor, as affected

by the grants and inspection of the Government, that the Commission principally devoted its attention. We propose to confine ourselves to the same branch of the subject ; not that army and navy schools, industrial institutions for neglected children, and the useful application of charitable endowments, are matters of small moment,—far from it,—but because the public mind has for the moment concentrated its notice upon the Government system and the Revised Code of Regulations.

The various sections of Protestant opinion combine with wonderful unanimity in condemning the proposed changes, which the official representatives of the National and Church-of-England Education Societies, of the British and Foreign, and Home and Colonial School Societies, and of the Wesleyan Education Committee, deem calculated to introduce into elementary schools a lower class of teachers, and to degrade the instruction in the schools. Harmony so unwonted proves the censure expressed in such grave terms to rest upon arguments of cogency ; while the circumstance that the agreement of the leaders of religious parties has not been found irresistible demonstrates the existence of a widespread impression that their arguments, though weighty, are inconclusive, and that possibly the interests of the nation lie apart from the wishes of the promoters of education.

Catholics alone have not as yet taken a prominent part in the discussion. In a free state, however, it would seem incumbent upon every considerable section of the community to give form and expression to its own views on any public question closely touching its interests ; and therefore, without pretension to lead or settle, we do not shrink from a frank consideration of recent controversies on popular education.

In forming a just estimate of measures which it is now proposed to supersede, we must look back to the period when Government afforded no assistance towards the instruction of the people. A brief retrospect carries us to the time when England was absolutely destitute of public schools for the labouring classes. It was in 1781 that a Gloucester publisher, named Raikes, opened the first Sunday-school ; and fifteen years later Joseph Lancaster introduced to public notice the monitorial system, and founded many schools for the education of children by their schoolfellows. Lancaster, however, was a dissenter ; and the credit of his discovery was disputed on the part of the Established Church by Dr. Andrew Bell, who, in the Madras Orphan School, had, as early as 1792, employed a boy of eight years of age to teach a class of

children to write the alphabet in sand, and who upon his return to this country, where dignities and wealth awaited him, established in 1811 the National School Society. To the honour thus disputed between the Established Church and the Society of Friends, English Catholics can lay no claim. Penal laws effectually excluded them from the promotion of popular education, and we believe there are but ten Catholic schools in the country founded earlier than 1801. It was, however, neither Bell nor Lancaster who in truth devised the monitorial method of teaching, but a Catholic ecclesiastic of France, who preceded them both by a century. In 1679 the Venerable Jean Baptiste de la Salle, canon of the cathedral church of Rheims, instituted the society of Brethren of the Christian Schools, who, in 1785, were already teaching 30,000 children. He it was who, in his Manual, first laid down a plan for the division and subdivision of the school-work by means of monitors, and he is in truth the earliest inventor of the mutual system, which, though discarded in France and generally discredited, still prevails in the Brothers' schools throughout England and Ireland. De la Salle founded his institute, as Pope Benedict XIII. in the Bull of Confirmation recites, "*piè considerans innumera quæ ex ignorantia, omnium origine malorum, proveniunt scandala, præsertim in illis, qui, vel egestate oppressi, vel fabrili operi unde vitam eliciant operam dantes, quarumvis scientiarum humanarum, ex defectu æris impendendi, non solum penitus rudes, sed, quod magis dolendum est, elementa religionis Christianæ persæpè ignorant.*"

In England during the eighteenth century, ignorance, *omnium origo malorum*, was little dreaded. Less than 3000 schools of all kinds existed in 1800. The bulk of these institutions were endowed, and comparatively few were maintained by the religious zeal or charity of the living. The people were left to ignorance. "*Hoc fonte derivata clades in patriam populumque fluxit.*" Sir James Shuttleworth thus describes the people of that time: "In the pauperised counties they were in a state resembling helotry. The labourers were bound to their parish by a strict law of settlement. They were largely dependent on the poor-rate. There were few or no schools. The population was ignorant and demoralised; it had the craft of the pauper, or of the pensioner on parochial doles, of the poacher and the squatter on the common—but not the manly bearing of the independent labourer. Wages varied from 7s. a week in Dorsetshire and some parts of Suffolk, to 10s. a week in other counties. The manufacturing and mining districts had been peopled in fifty years

with a vast population gathered from these pauper counties, —from wolds, moors, fens, and from the wild desolate hills and glens of the Border and of Wales. The villages, and even the towns, were rude, irregular; to a great extent unsewered and unpaved,—without proper water-supply or police. Entire districts were without church or school, and religious teaching was supplied by voluntary agencies, while education was given almost solely in scattered Sunday-schools.”

In 1832 the British Government first attempted to apply a remedy to evils so enormous, by taking a vote of 20,000*l.* to be administered by the Treasury, for the promotion of popular education. Religious animosity extinguished the hope of complete measures. The public mind was indifferent or hostile; and of the few who promoted schools, the majority were actuated by a desire to swell particular congregations, rather than to rear better men and more useful citizens. From 1832 to 1839 the sum of 20,000*l.* annually granted by Parliament was expended by the Treasury in erecting school-buildings on applications presented through the two great educational societies, the National, and the British and Foreign. In the appropriation of money through such channels Catholics were unlikely to participate. Slowly, and here and there, they undertook from their own resources the difficult task of establishing elementary schools; and between the beginning of the century and 1831, fifty-two institutions of the class appear to have been opened.

In 1839 the parliamentary grant for education was raised to 30,000*l.*, and its administration intrusted to a special committee of the Privy Council appointed for the purpose. Frustrated in its attempt to originate a normal school free from the control of the dominant Church, the Committee of Council recognised, in the adoption of denominational agency, the only feasible plan of combating the ignorance of the people. They continued, therefore, for several years to spend the grant, as the Treasury had done, in promoting school-building; and they also aided the erection and maintenance of normal colleges under the religious societies, which in those early days were little better than large central schools, where teachers from a distance might, in a few weeks' residence, pick up the mechanical contrivances of the monitorial method. Meantime inspectors were employed to examine the condition and wants of particular districts; and their reports demonstrated the imperative necessity of providing a better class of masters and a more complete system of training. The organisation of Dutch schools was thought to afford a

model peculiarly suitable for imitation. In other parts of the Continent, where education has received attention, the proportion of pupils to a master is strictly limited ; so that many small rooms, and an equal number of capable teachers, are required for the instruction of a mass of children ; but in Holland a master of intelligence and attainments is able, by means of assistants, called pupil-teachers, to instruct in one room 500 or 600 scholars. The peculiarities of this system appeared appropriate to England, where the children were numerous and ignorant, the schools already provided mostly large, and efficient teachers extremely few. Accordingly, in the Minutes of 1846, the Committee of Council offered to pay for five years the salary of pupil-teachers to be apprenticed to the master, and moreover to furnish the apprentices, at the expiration of their service, with exhibitions equivalent to free support in a training college. When duly trained, they were to be examined and classified ; and, according to success in the examination, were to receive Government augmentations of salary during service in elementary schools. Building-grants were continued, and even increased in amount ; and at a later date the Privy Council undertook, under the name of Capitation Grant, to subscribe towards the school-expenses 5s. or 6s. a head for every child who had attended the school 176 days in the course of the preceding year. Grants were also made for the purchase of books and apparatus, and for the support of industrial classes.

Such has been the system of grants into which the Royal Commission was appointed to inquire. The Government contributed towards the erection of the school sometimes as much as one-half of the total cost ; it aided the purchase of books and maps ; it subscribed towards the current expenses, in proportion to the number and regularity of the scholars ; it increased the master's salary ; it wholly paid his assistants, for whom also it provided Queen's scholarships and training colleges, in order that they in turn might fit themselves to become masters of schools similarly supported. Between 1839 and 1861 more than 5,000,000*l.* has been drawn for these purposes from the national treasury. Building colleges and schools has in round numbers absorbed 1,250,000*l.* ; salaries of masters and mistresses, 500,000*l.* ; pupil-teachers, 1,750,000*l.* ; capitation grants, 250,000*l.* ; support of training colleges, 500,000*l.* ; books and apparatus, 50,000*l.* ; industrial schools, 100,000*l.* ; inspection and administration, 500,000*l.*

Previous to an inquiry into the judgment of the Com-

mission upon this gigantic outlay, it will be desirable to examine the share in it obtained by Catholics. Until 1849 Catholics obtained nothing whatever. Parliament had already devoted 630,000*l.* to school purposes, and chiefly to the erection of schools, which had been wholly absorbed by Protestants. In 1849 Catholics began to receive a small share in the grants given towards the annual expenses of schools; but difficulty in settling the trust-deed of aided schools, aggravated by the anti-Papal excitement of 1851, excluded them from a participation in building-grants until 1852; and even after a satisfactory arrangement had been made, the effects of a prolonged and ill-understood discussion naturally disinclined the promoters of new schools to seek assistance from the parliamentary fund. Thus it happened that the country was every where dotted with state-erected Protestant schools before any Catholic schools had obtained building-grants. And the same with training colleges. Nineteen Protestant institutions existed in 1846, ready at once to avail themselves of the Government endowment of scholarships; while, until 1855 no provision had been made for the training of Catholic Queen's scholars. Catholics, then, may be truly affirmed, through no fault of their own, to be ten years behind their Protestant fellow-countrymen in this matter of education grants; and although out of 5,000,000*l.* expended they have now obtained 166,000*l.*, yet while maintaining five per cent of the schools, they have received but three per cent of the money; and the changes, if changes must now be made in the system, will for them arrive ten years too soon.

The changes proposed emanate from two sources,—the Royal Commission and the Committee of Privy Council. The first class are embodied in the Report of the Commissioners; the second are set forth in the Revised Code of Minutes. The grave defects of the existing system are alleged by the Commissioners to consist in its tendency to indefinite expense; its inability to assist the poorer districts; the partial inadequacy of its teaching; and the complicated business which encumbers the central office of the Committee of Council. The Commissioners, though avowing that a large expenditure, if well applied, is rather a necessity of a state system than in itself an evil, yet shrink from an annual outlay of 2,100,000*l.*, with a possible extension to the enormous sum of 5,000,000*l.*, for an object the benefits of which they declare to be in great measure local. Since the grant is administered under a code of general rules, and as every parish, however apathetic, has within it property

capable of meeting the educational wants of its population, the Commissioners consider it unjust, and practically impossible, to relax conditions in favour of poorer schools, which therefore, as long as non-resident proprietors neglect their duty, must remain without the stimulus and support of Government assistance. They affirm, too, that elementary subjects are imperfectly taught in aided schools, and that three-fourths of the scholars, after leaving school, forget every thing they have learnt there. Into the trials and perils of the central office it is needless to pursue the Commissioners; for if the country and parliament desire to make education universal, and will provide the necessary funds, ample accommodation and an able staff will surely be available.

These defects are necessarily aggravated by the denominational system. Important as the maintenance of this system is, it is impossible not to see that by multiplying schools and teachers, it wastes both private and public funds; that by distributing the inspection in one locality among various officers, it deprives the Privy Council of complete and accurate information regarding places truly destitute; and that by the same process, it destroys uniformity of standard everywhere, and while promoting rivalry and pretension in competing schools, discourages the dry but fundamental work of teaching elements to junior classes. But the country happily will not abandon the denominational subdivision of schools, and no proposal in such a direction is even possible at present; though the acquiescence in the inspection of reformatory and industrial schools of all creeds by the same officer, leads us to fear that the hostility formerly expressed was one rather of feeling than of principle,—one that may yield to the influences of time and money. Neither the Commissioners nor the Privy Council propose a change here. The managers of a great majority of schools would object, they justly think, to being placed under an inspector or examiner of a different communion from their own; and for similar reasons they do not propose to disturb the existing regulations on the appointment of inspectors, which are considered of importance by the different religious communities, and are not used in an illiberal spirit. Not that the managers really have what they imagine in the matter of examiners; for the officers of the Privy Council bearing that name are all university men belonging to the Established Church; and, as far as inspectors are employed to revise examination-papers, the division, we understand, is made by subjects, and not by denominations. The Commissioners

could not agree in recommending the abolition of the distinction between members of the Establishment and others. The majority, indeed, thought that the rule should be made uniform for all denominations alike; but, in deference to the different opinion of the minority, they abstained from making any recommendation.

Thus, maintaining the denominational arrangements intact, even where they might be reformed without sacrifice of the principle, and leaving the erection of new schools to be aided as before, the Commissioners recommended that the existing forms of annual grants to primary schools should be abolished, and their places supplied by a duplicate system of aid, which they, but no one else, regarded as simple and feasible. One stream of public money was to be drawn from the Privy Council on the recommendation of the Queen's inspector, while the county or borough rate was to supply a subsidiary rivulet directed by county-magistrates and certificated examiners. The proposal of a rate ruined the scheme. No ministry would dream of submitting it to the House of Commons, and the organs of public opinion unanimously pronounced it impracticable.

The Commissioners give it as their opinion that the country is not committed to the maintenance of any existing grants. The class of persons most deeply interested in disputing this decision is composed of certificated teachers, who have not been slow to raise their voices against the threatened breach of faith. The Commissioners plead that teachers have really no moral right to the continuance of their augmentation grants; because the present system is supported by sums voted annually, and not by a permanent charge on the Consolidated Fund; because it has grown up by degrees amidst changes and discussions; because the arrangement to augment the teacher's salary holds as between the State and the managers, and not between the State and the teachers, being for the benefit of the school, and not for the benefit of the teachers; and, because the average emoluments of certificated masters exceed the amount contemplated when augmentations were proposed. The teachers, on the other hand, urge that, in reliance on State grants, they have selected their profession, have devoted many years to preparation, have spent labour and money in passing examinations, have always received their augmentation in post-office orders made payable to themselves and not to their managers, and have believed, amidst all proposals of change and improvement, that their position during good service was guaranteed to them by the.

inviolable faith of the British nation. Some have gone so far as to maintain the existence of a legal contract binding on the Government. But this ground appears untenable; and, however anxious we may feel that expectations excited by the Government should be honourably met, still it must be allowed that the schoolmaster will expose himself to ridicule and contempt by striving to support his legal claim against the opinion of Sir John Coleridge and the other Commissioners.

Pupil-teachers already apprenticed occupy a safer position. For the residue of their respective terms of service the State is plainly bound to provide their stipends, or to make satisfactory arrangements for their release. Even in this case the obligation is moral, since the indentures are unstamped, and the Privy Council is not a party to them. To repudiate their claim, however, would be a course too disgraceful for a moment's contemplation; and for five years the Government will be obliged to maintain to some extent one of the present modes of annual aid.

With this exception, the Royal Commission recommend that all existing grants should be abolished, and superseded by other plans of assistance; and the Revised Code proposes to carry the recommendation into effect. It may be well, then, to consider, in reference to each form of grant, the peculiar objections to which it is liable.

The most unexceptionable form of aid is perhaps to promote the erection of new buildings. The expenditure of national treasure here produces tangible results, which can be seen and measured. The results, too, are as permanent as brick and mortar can make them, and they lie at the foundation of improvement. A room to teach in would seem the groundwork of a school. The million of money contributed for this purpose by the State, in combination with two and a quarter millions from private subscriptions, has created accommodation for 694,069 children, in 5410 places.

This accommodation is enough for about one-fourth of the whole number of children of school age, and remains a monument of the success of the system under consideration. Not even building grants, however, escape animadversion. Schools have not invariably been built on the best sites. Sometimes they are too near to other schools, sometimes too large for the population, sometimes with rooms too numerous to be kept open. Nor have the plans of aided schools been always appropriate. Architects commit extravagances; and in many cases schools built with Government assistance

possess finer exteriors than the corresponding church or chapel. Wealth often designs and places schools for the gratification of its own taste rather than for the benefit of poor children. The Government, deriving all its information from local promoters, cannot prevent mistakes, and in the valuation of school-sites and other matters it is liable to be deceived by excessive estimates. Nevertheless, the erection of so many handsome schools within twenty years must be considered an achievement splendid in itself, and full of promise for future generations.

The building of thirty-two training colleges, generally aided by grants, deserves equal praise. These colleges have reared a very large number of certificated teachers, of whom eight thousand are known to be actually conducting primary schools. In a word, they furnish the teaching power of the country. So impressed were the Commissioners with the importance of training colleges, that, although the contributions of the State form at present seventy-six per cent of their annual income, and, with greater success in examinations, may hereafter yield the whole of it, yet they do not recommend any reduction in the amount or forms of aid, and after a minute critical investigation of the system pursued in them, leave the subject in the hands of the Committee of Council. Mr. Marshall, indeed, in his evidence somewhat over-estimates the rate of aid to colleges. (1376.) "What is the proportion of the aid furnished by Government to the training schools as compared with the whole expense?—The whole. There could not be any training colleges in the kingdom without that aid. There may be a certain class of students who pay for themselves. (1377.) When you say 'in the kingdom,' do you include Protestant colleges?—I have very little personal knowledge of those, but my impression is, that very many of those who are there have been pupil-teachers. With us the teachers have no salaries at all. The building at Hammersmith has been erected partly by the aid of the Government, and partly by voluntary contributions. At Liverpool and St. Leonard's the training schools were erected at the sole cost of the communities who direct them. We have an immense mass of teachers whose aid is given gratuitously,* which tells

* Is the statement exact, that Catholics have an immense mass of religious teachers whose aid is "given gratuitously," whose "time and labours are given absolutely gratis"? Is there reason why it should be so? That nuns do not teach *for the sake* of salary is true; but that they almost every where receive either salary, or an equivalent in school-fees, is, we believe, equally certain. Nuns must be fed and clothed, and nursed when sick, and maintained in old age. Active orders commonly admit postulants with little or no

upon the training schools, and also upon the industrial schools." Mr. Allies writes to the same effect. "The Privy-Council grant has not only helped to build our male training college, but its annual grants largely support it. Our female training school at Liverpool was built at the sole expense of the religious Sisterhood of Notre Dame, which directs it, and that of St. Leonard's at the sole expense of the Sisters of the Holy Child; but these religious orders were moved to this great act of charity by the knowledge that the Privy Council would grant scholarships and exhibitions to pupil-teachers and others who should be put under their care. Their own time and labour are given absolutely gratis; but the Government annual grant, supplemented by a small allowance from the Catholic Poor-school Committee, is sufficient to defray the expenses of the training schools."

If it be true that the Government grant defrays all, or nearly all, the expenses of these institutions, then it would seem that the first principle of the State system has been openly violated. The basis on which the Committee of Council rests its plan is, to originate nothing, but to contribute proportionate aid towards approved measures initiated by societies or individuals, and thus to share the burdens of education by participating in the expense. As Catholics, we rejoice to see the training colleges, which are our only lay colleges, so easily and respectably maintained; but, as Englishmen and tax-payers, we can hardly hold it to be fair that the State should bear the burden alone. Teachers for the upper and middle classes are not trained. This immense advantage is confined to the teachers of the poor, and by them alone the art of method is systematically cultivated. Hence trained teachers become, as Mr. Marshall testifies, "the most valuable class for recruiting religious communities," and are even appreciated at Oscott, Sedgley Park, and Old Hall Green; while the children of higher rank often fall into incompetent or defiled hands. "I have continually to examine mistresses," says Mr. Tufnell, "who have come from the higher schools, and who sometimes have been governesses in superior families. Though my ex-dowry. They must, then, live on the proceeds of their work, just as a priest does, or a bishop. The arrangement is perfectly honourable, and sanctioned by the highest authority. But to declare publicly that time and labour in teaching are given "absolutely gratis" by nuns who every day exact payment from scholars, and no one of whom ever yet declined her augmentation of salary from Government, or her allowance for instructing apprentices, is to place religious ladies in a false position, and needlessly to expose their conduct to malicious comment. The services of teaching orders are intrinsically valuable, and do not need the inflation of hollow pretences.

amination is very slight, and I do not put any other questions sometimes, excepting in the Bible and in arithmetic, their knowledge is so surprisingly small, that they could not pass as good an examination as a pupil-teacher in the second year: frequently they cannot spell; frequently they know nothing of the Bible; and they are ignorant of every principle of arithmetic. Sometimes I ask them what they do know; and then I find it is a little crochet-work, and a little playing on the piano, a little French and a little Italian, and a little of accomplishments of that sort; and these women have often been governesses in superior families, and very often in private schools. I have sometimes been the means of dismissing a master from a school; sometimes from gross ignorance, and sometimes from gross immorality; and in some cases I have been curious to find out what has become of them. In almost every case I have found they have become ushers in gentlemen's schools; they are too bad for pauper-schools; they cannot enter any pauper-school in the kingdom, because the Poor-Law Board taboo them; but they have gone into gentlemen's schools."

Lamentable as it is, this is a matter in which gentlemen must be left to take care of themselves, unless they are prepared to see the public instruction of all classes alike made into an administrative department of the State, under a Napoleonic *bureau de l'esprit publique*. The best way, perhaps, for our politicians to teach the middle and upper classes the practical lesson of the utility of training for their own schoolmasters, is to induce them personally to take an interest in the established training colleges for primary teachers. If men of wealth and position could be brought to subscribe for the support of training colleges for poor-school teachers, they might in time come to reflect upon the advantages of securing an equal education for the teachers of their own children. Any how, the upper classes should remember, that if they leave the State to pay the whole cost of these institutions out of the national treasury, they will not be able to resist its claim to appoint the professors, settle the discipline, and fix the course of studies.

The payment of augmentations of salary to school-teachers, and the system of examinations on which it is based, may be criticised in several particulars. Free training and the promise of augmented salary are unaccompanied by any covenant on the teacher's part to render educational service. In Catholic Belgium, normalists in return for their training pledge themselves to serve the public as primary teachers for at least five years; and within that

period young schoolmistresses are forbidden to marry or to enter religion. In England no pledge has been asked. Then, again, the division of teachers into classes, according to the amount of literary attainment exhibited in an examination, useful, no doubt, as a stimulus to exertion during the period of training, becomes unreal and even baneful when maintained throughout life. That a schoolmaster, because at twenty years of age he has passed one brilliant examination, should, for teaching the rudiments to a score of stupid rustics, continue, year by year, to draw from the coffers of the State an augmentation of 30*l.*, while his neighbour of the third class, a born teacher, receives but half the amount for zealous, self-sacrificing, and successful toil, in a town school of two hundred boys, would seem as unjust to the public as to the masters. The issue of parchment certificates may also end in embarrassment, when their number, in lapse of time and with change of inspectors, grows too large for identification. Like annuitants, certificated teachers may be expected to enjoy long lives.

With unanimous consent, the most successful of existing educational plans is considered to be the apprenticeship of pupil-teachers. Catholics share the opinion, but with less reason than others, since with us success has not attended the apprenticeship of boys; but Mr. Allies attributes "whatever improvement has taken place to zealous coöperation with the Privy-Council system." In investigating the cause of partial failure, Mr. Marshall lays great stress upon the inadequacy of a stipend which averages 15*l.* a year. (1366.) "My own experience is this," he says; "that when you propose to a parent that you will pay his boy 10*l.* at the end of the twelve months, conditionally upon his making certain progress, he laughs in your face; he thinks it is not a serious proposition, and I confess that I wish it was not a serious one; because they can earn very much more, and be paid weekly, without any conditions whatsoever, except the due performance of their work. I have no doubt that the small amount paid to the pupil-teachers has been most injurious to us." Inadequacy of pay, however, can scarcely be accepted as an explanation of the failure of Catholic male apprentices; for, since our people are more indigent than others, the pay to them, small though it be, would possess comparatively a higher value; and finding fewer openings for their sons, they would offer them more freely as pupil-teachers. Especially might this be expected to happen among Irish parents, whose preference for intellectual work is well established. It is not so much the small pay of

the boy during apprenticeship, as the position of the schoolmaster, which keeps clever promising lads out of the profession. Low salaries, irksome relations towards managers, no career, hopeless old age or premature death, form small attractions towards the schoolmaster's calling. The Protestant master in all respects meets better treatment; and so the sons of decent Protestant families are every where willing to accept the stipend of a pupil-teacher, with the view of becoming schoolmasters. If the system has failed to attract Catholic boys, it is in the internal condition of our own body, rather than in the inadequacy of Government pay, that the explanation will be found. Some of the objections most frequently alleged against the pupil-teacher system have already been noticed. The stipend is small, is paid after a whole year's service, and is then conditional upon success in an examination, and on managers' testimonials. The pay, moreover, is uniform throughout Great Britain; the same in the Highlands of Scotland or mountains of Wales as in the busiest haunts of London and Manchester. Girls earn as much as boys, and—gravest objection of all—the remuneration comes wholly from Government. Managers nominate; the State pays.

Of all Government grants, capitation appears the least defensible. It directly partakes of the nature of a bribe, and induces managers to put schools under inspection, not for the improvement of education, but in the hope of profit. It resembles the vicious plan of drawing children to school by offers of food and clothing. That, after contributing half the cost of building a school, paying the third of the master's salary and the whole of the assistants' stipends, and furnishing books and maps, the State should subscribe to every school in the ratio of attendance,—that is, in inverse proportion to the wants of the school,—betokens an extravagance which would go far to warrant the suspicion that Government has some sinister end in subsidising schools, and may be thwarted by rejection of its offers. Thus managers are sometimes betrayed into the absurd attitude of threatening to withdraw their schools, because they cannot believe the education of children to be an adequate motive of extraordinary liberality. Capitation granted on attendance is mainly earned by two classes which least deserve assistance. Both the elder children attending regularly from respectable homes, and the youngest infants sent to school as to a public nursery, merely to be out of the way, ought to defray their full share of the school's cost; yet it is these very children for whom the State pays capitation.

Again, it is the small school whose support creates difficulty and demands sacrifices, yet it is the large school which procures the liberal grants; and there can be little doubt that many flourishing institutions, which are, or might easily be made, self-supporting, wastefully expend 40*l.* or 50*l.* a year supplied by the nation.

Grants towards the purchase of books and maps are useful, especially in new schools; and the list of educational works circulated by the Privy Council has brought the best series into general notice. Complaints, however, arise. An Evangelical clergyman, of more piety than information, buys, deluded by the title, the books of the Christian Brothers, and, shuddering to find them Popish, deafens the Privy Council with his outcry. A Catholic priest chooses from the list a Protestant history, and then appeals to his Bishop against the calumnies propagated by Government authority in Catholic schools. The booksellers complain that the list, however extended, keeps new and improved works out of the market. No general system is pursued. In one school, books are furnished, without charge, for the children's use; in another, they are sold at reduced price; in a third, they are sold at a profit; from a fourth, they pass into the hands of the public; many remain in the managers' library; some have even been seen in the pawnbroker's shop.

Of grants for industrial schools little need be said. Industry is not schooling, nor should the education-grant be confounded with the poor's rate. In dealing with such institutions, the State must take care that it does not lessen the employment of the industrious independent poor, and thus deprive honest families of bread. To escape abuse, industrial schools must be under stricter control than the occasional visit of an inspector.

The Minute of the Committee of the Privy Council on Education, establishing a Revised Code of Regulations, sets aside as impracticable the Commissioners' proposal to raise public aid for schools by means of county and borough rates, and, relying upon an enlarged staff of managers for the increase of local interest, merges all existing classes of casual grants into a payment of so much per child to those who undertake the responsibility of supporting and conducting the school. Thus, at one stroke, are abolished, with all their merits and abuses, grants for books and apparatus, direct payments to teachers certified and apprenticed, and special grants for drawing and industrial work.

Substituted for all the old forms of annual grants is a capitation to the managers, calculated per scholar at the rate

of one penny for every attendance, after the first one hundred at morning or afternoon school, and after the first twelve at the evening school. A child who attends less than one hundred mornings or afternoons entitles the school to nothing. But all the children for whom any grant is claimed will be examined individually in reading, writing, and arithmetic, according to age; and failure in any one subject will forfeit one-third of the allowance. A child who can neither read, write, nor cipher gains no capitation, although he may have been present at every meeting of the school. The grant thus calculated upon the regular scholars who display certain rudimentary attainments is, moreover, liable to forfeiture or reduction. It will be wholly forfeited if the building be bad, the teacher uncertified, the girls uninstructed in plain needlework, the registers inaccurate, any grievous objection alleged by the inspector, or if there be not at least three managers to receive the public money. It will be reduced by not less than one-tenth, or more than one-half, upon the inspector's report, for faults of instruction or discipline, for want of repairs, or of furniture, books, and apparatus. Besides this, 10*l.* will be deducted for every thirty scholars, after the first fifty, for whose instruction a pupil-teacher is not employed; and further, the grant will be cut down if it should exceed the amount of school fee and subscriptions, or the rate of 15*s.* per scholar in average attendance. The grant, whatever be the amount, will be payable only at the end of the school year. Meantime, the managers will be legally bound by agreement to pay the pupil-teachers weekly, and they will make their own bargains with any other assistants, as well as with the certificated masters and mistresses. In return for more ample authority over the school and teachers, the managers will be required to bear a larger share in the risk.

Opinions upon the working of the new system must be speculative and uncertain; but the best authorities compute that, in comparison with former grants, the Revised Code will effect a reduction of about two-fifths in the amount of aid. What is certain is, that, during the first year of the new plan, school-managers must advance about 300,000*l.* hitherto supplied by Government, and must bear the risk of losing an indeterminate portion of this large amount. The annual grants in 1860 paid to English Catholic schools were six times larger than the income of the Catholic Poor-school Committee; and such a sum as 25,000*l.* could only be raised among us at the cost of prodigious exertion and consequent prostration. Hearty efforts might, how-

ever, be made to meet new demands. Local zeal might be stimulated, and interest in schools diffused. Once at work, the new system might be healthier and of better augury than an enervating reliance on public money.

The Revised Code is said to rest upon the principle of paying for results. Some fallacy, however, lurks in the argument, since the new Code pays for time as well as for attainment. If a boy's reading be a "result," then it should be paid for, even though acquired in fewer than one hundred school attendances. Judging by "results," the master who works quickest works best, and deserves highest pay; whereas, by the Code, the longer a result is in being produced, the more must be paid for it. The principle of the new system would seem to be not so much to pay for results in attainment, as to pay for regularity of attendance combined with proof that school-time has not been quite lost. A boy, by attending regularly the same school from three years of age to twelve, may earn for it 15s. a year. Another boy, moving from school to school, may never earn a grant at all. Both may, when twelve years old, be able to read a short paragraph in a newspaper, may write from dictation, and work a sum in practice. The "results" in the two cases are identical; yet for one the State will have paid 6*l.* 15*s.*; for the other, nothing. The only fair test of a school is the condition of the scholars who pass regularly and studiously through it. To pretend to qualify lads of any capacity to leave at any age from any class, would be farcical. The first class must contain the most advanced boys, and receive the largest share of attention. It is paradoxical to judge a school by its youngest or stupidest scholars. The interest of the State, no doubt, demands that the mass of children should acquire the elements of knowledge, rather than that the few should obtain the benefit of an advanced education. But the attempt to reduce numbers of boys to a dead level, unphilosophical and opposed to providential arrangements, would extinguish in the breasts of all of them the desire to learn, and would effectually destroy intellectual results.

In dealing with training colleges, the new Code adopts a policy which must prove disastrous, if not fatal. Upon the machinery for moulding teachers depends the success of education. The Commissioners, with all their love of economy, recommend the uncurtailed maintenance of grants to training colleges. But the Code cuts them down in such a way as to sacrifice the efficient to the inefficient institutions; for it abolishes twenty per cent of the Queen's scholarships, and admits a number equal to four-fifths of the accommodation.

Thus, a college which has failed to attain reputation enough to fill its dormitories may draw as large a grant as before, while the full and flourishing establishment will lose one-fifth of its support. Again, the experience of many years, acquired under various conditions and among different sects, shows that a training of two years is absolutely necessary for the formation of character in the young and undisciplined teachers; and therefore pains have hitherto been taken to secure a two years' residence. The Code innovates on this settled plan, and by offering no advantage whatever to the student of two years' training, will practically reduce the training to one year, and undermine the system and results of the colleges. With regard to sex, moreover, no distinction is made between male and female teachers; and since a master's school is more costly than one under a schoolmistress, the grants being exactly the same in either case, the consequence will be, to commit the vast majority of children, boys as well as girls, to the hands of female teachers of only one year's training. Nor is this the worst; for pupil-teachers without any training at all may be certified under the Code for immediate service in schools of eighty children or less; and these young persons, being the lowest and cheapest, may perhaps become the most popular, of teachers.

And here arises a hardship of peculiar incidence. The general preference displayed by Catholics for Religious as teachers spreads throughout the kingdom with the multiplication of Communities, and their willingness to teach mixed schools of boys and girls. Mr. Marshall, indeed, declares that (1399) "we have such a very large number now of religious communities in England, that the tendency is to confine the instruction of girls, as far as Catholics are concerned, exclusively to Religious, and I have no doubt that that will be the result. Already there are very large towns in which there is not a single secular Catholic teacher, and I see distinctly that the time is coming when there will be no secular teachers." We think that, for some time to come, schools of a hundred children and upwards will probably, one after another, be placed in charge of nuns. Meantime schools of eighty children, and under, will have been intrusted to the cheap untrained apprentices; and no sphere will remain open to the trained students from our admirable colleges, excepting the slender number of institutions too small for Religious- and too large for pupil-teachers. Thus Liverpool and St. Leonard's, having destroyed Hammersmith, will themselves succumb before untrained teachers, religious

and secular ; and the whole system of the training colleges, elaborated by such zealous ability, and capable of such grand results, will be finally and irretrievably ruined.

Whatever may come of discussions in Parliament,—whatever parts of the Revised Code may ultimately be adopted,—the interests of primary education imperatively require that the training colleges should be sustained, since by no other means can the country be supplied with teachers of known character and ascertained efficiency. The Lord President is reported lately to have visited the Liverpool College. What he saw on that occasion—and further investigation would show very much more of solid excellence—will indispose him to damage so flourishing and useful an institution, and to sacrifice the valuable class to which it belongs, for the simplification of the Privy-Council Office.

MR. GOLDWIN SMITH'S IRISH HISTORY.*

WHEN Macaulay republished his Essays from the *Edinburgh Review*, he had already commenced the great work by which his name will be remembered ; and he had the prudence to exclude from the collection his early paper on the art of historical writing. In the maturity of his powers, he was rightly unwilling to bring into notice the theories of his youth. At a time when he was about to claim a place among the first historians, it would have been injudicious to remind men of the manner in which he had described the objects of his emulation or of his rivalry—how in his judgment the speeches of Thucydides violate the decencies of fiction, and give to his book something of the character of the Chinese pleasure-grounds, whilst his political observations are very superficial,—how Polybius has no other merit than that of a faithful narrator of facts,—and how in the nineteenth century, from the practice of distorting narrative in conformity with theory, “ history proper is disappearing.” But in that essay, although the judgments are puerile, the ideal at which the writer afterwards aimed is distinctly drawn, and his own character is prefigured in the description of the author of a history of England as it ought to be, who “ gives to truth those attractions which have been

* Irish History and Irish Character. By Goldwin Smith. Parker, 1861.

usurped by fiction," "intersperses the details which are the charm of historical romances," and "reclaims those materials which the novelist has appropriated."

Mr. Goldwin Smith, like Macaulay, has written on the study of history, and he has been a keen critic of other historians before becoming one himself. It is a bold thing for a man to bring theory so near to execution, and, amidst dispute on his principles and resentment at his criticism, to give an opportunity of testing his theories by his own practice, and of applying his own canons to his performance. It reminds us of the professor of Cologne, who wrote the best Latin poem of modern times as a model for his pupils; and of the author of an attack on Dryden's *Virgil*, who is styled by Pope the "fairest of critics," "because," says Johnson, "he exhibited his own version to be compared with that which he condemned." The work in which the professor of history and critic of historians teaches by example is not unworthy of his theory, whilst some of its defects may be explained by it.

The point which most closely connects Mr. Goldwin Smith's previous writings with his *Irish History* is his vindication of a moral code against those who identify moral with physical laws, who consider the outward regularity with which actions are done to be the inward reason why they must be done, and who conceive that all laws are opposed to freedom. In his opposition to this materialism, he goes in one respect too far, in another not far enough. On the one hand, whilst defending liberty and morality, he has not sufficient perception of the spiritual element; and on the other, he seems to fear that it would be a concession to his antagonists to dwell on the constant laws by which nature asserts herself, and on the regularity with which like causes produce like effects. Yet it is on the observation of these laws that political, social, and economical science rest; and it is by the knowledge of them that a scientific historian is guided in grouping his matter. In this he differs from the artist, whose principle of arrangement is drawn from himself, not from external nature; and from the annalist, who has no arrangement, since he sees, not the connexion, but the succession of events. Facts are intelligible and instructive,—or, in other words, history exhibits truths as well as facts,—when they are seen not merely as they follow, but as they correspond; not merely as they have happened, but as they are paralleled. The fate of Ireland is to be understood not simply from the light of English and Irish history, but by the general history of other conquests, colonies, dependencies, and

establishments. In this sort of illustration by analogy and contrast Mr. Goldwin Smith is particularly infelicitous.

Nor does Providence gain what science loses by his treatment of history. He rejects materialism, but he confines his view to motives and forces which are purely human. The Catholic Church receives, therefore, very imperfect measure at his hands. Her spiritual character and purpose he cannot discern behind the temporal instruments and appendages of her existence; he confounds authority with influence, devotion with bigotry, power with force of arms, and estimates the vigour and durability of Catholicism by criterions as material as those of the philosophers he has so vehemently and so ably refuted. Most Protestant writers fail in approbation; he fails in appreciation. It is not so much a religious feeling that makes him unjust, as a way of thinking which, in great measure, ignores the supernatural, and therefore precludes a just estimate of religion in general, and of Catholicism in particular. Hence he is unjust rather to the nature than to the actions of the Church. He caricatures more than he libels her. He is much less given to misrepresentation and calumny than Macaulay, but he has a less exalted idea of the history and character of Catholicism. As he underrates what is divine, so he has no very high standard for the actions of men; and he is liberal in admitting extenuating circumstances. Though he never suspends the severity of his moral judgment in consideration of the purpose or the result, yet he is induced by a variety of arguments to mitigate its rigour. In accordance with the theory he has formerly developed, he is constantly sitting in judgment; and he discusses the morality of men and actions far oftener than history, which has very different problems to solve, either requires or tolerates. De Maistre says that in our time compassion is reserved for the guilty. Mr. Goldwin Smith is a merciful judge, whose compassion generally increases in proportion to the greatness of the culprit; and he has a sympathy for what is done in the grand style, which balances his hatred of what is wrongly done.

It would not be fair to judge of an author's notion and powers of research by a hasty and popular production. Mr. Goldwin Smith has collected quite enough information for the purpose for which he has used it, and he has not failed through want of industry. The test of solidity is not the quantity read, but the mode in which the knowledge has been collected and used. Method, not genius, or eloquence, or erudition, makes the historian. He may be discovered most easily by his use of authorities. The first question is,

whether the writer understands the comparative value of sources of information, and has the habit of giving precedence to the most trustworthy informant. There are some vague indications that Mr. Goldwin Smith does not understand the importance of this fundamental rule. In his Inaugural Lecture, published two years ago, the following extravagant sentence occurs: "Before the Revolution, the fervour and the austerity of Rousseau had cast out from good society the levity and sensuality of Voltaire" (p. 15). This view—which he appears to have abandoned, for in his *Irish History* he tells us that France "has now become the eldest daughter of Voltaire"—he supports by a reference to an abridgment of French history, much and justly esteemed in French schools, but, like all abridgments, not founded on original knowledge, and disfigured by exaggeration in the colouring. Moreover, the passage he refers to has been misinterpreted. In the *Irish History* Mr. Goldwin Smith quotes, for the character of the early Celts, without any sufficient reason, another French historian, Martin, who has no great authority, and the younger Thierry, who has none at all. This is a point of very little weight by itself; but until our author vindicates his research by other writings, it is not in his favour.

The defects of Mr. Goldwin Smith's historic art, his lax criticism, his superficial acquaintance with foreign countries, his occasional proneness to sacrifice accuracy for the sake of rhetorical effect, his aversion for spiritual things, are all covered by one transcendent merit, which, in a man of so much ability, promises great results. Writers the most learned, the most accurate in details, and the soundest in tendency, frequently fall into a habit which can neither be cured nor pardoned,—the habit of making history into the proof of their theories. The absence of a definite didactic purpose is the only security for the good faith of a historian. This most rare virtue Mr. Goldwin Smith possesses in a high degree. He writes to tell the truths he finds, not to prove the truths which he believes. In character and design he is eminently truthful and fair, though not equally so in execution. His candour never fails him, and he is never betrayed by his temper; yet his defective knowledge of general history, and his crude notions of the Church, have made him write many things which are untrue, and some which are unjust. Prejudice is in all men of such early growth, and so difficult to eradicate, that it becomes a misfortune rather than a reproach, especially if it is due to ignorance and not to passion, and if it has not its seat in the will. In

the case of Mr. Goldwin Smith it is of the curable and harmless kind. The fairness of his intention is far beyond his knowledge. When he is unjust, it is not from hatred; where he is impartial, it is not always from the copiousness of his information. His prejudices are of a nature which his ability and honesty will in time inevitably overcome.

The general result and moral of his book is excellent. He shows that the land-question has been from the beginning the great difficulty in Ireland; and he concludes with a condemnation of the Established Church, and a prophecy of its approaching fall. The weakness of Ireland and the guilt of England are not disguised; and the author has not written to stimulate the anger of one nation or to attenuate the remorse of the other. To both he gives wise and statesman-like advice that may soon be very opportune. The first American war was the commencement of the deliverance of Ireland, and it may be that a new American war will complete the work of regeneration which the first began. Agreeing as we do with the policy of the author, and admiring the spirit of his book, we shall not attempt either to enforce or to dispute his conclusions, and we shall confine our remarks to less essential points on which he appears to us in the wrong.

There are several instances of inaccuracy and negligence which, however trivial in themselves, tend to prove that the author is not always very scrupulous in speaking of things he has not studied. A purist so severe as to write "Kelt" for "Celt," ought not to call Mercury, originally a very different personage from Hermes, one of "the legendary authors of Greek civilisation" (43); and we do not believe that any body who had read the writings of the two primates could call Bramhall "an inferior counterpart of Laud" (105). In a loftier mood, and therefore apparently with still greater license, Mr. Goldwin Smith declares that "the glorious blood of Orange could scarcely have run in a low persecutor's veins" (123). The blood of Orange ran in the veins of William the Silent, the threefold hypocrite, who professed Catholicism whilst he hoped to retain his influence at court, Lutheranism when there was a chance of obtaining assistance from the German princes, Calvinism when he was forced to resort to religion in order to excite the people against the crown, and who persecuted the Protestants in Orange and the Catholics in Holland.

These, however, are matters of no consequence whatever in a political history of Ireland; but we find ourselves at issue with the author on the important question of political

freedom. "Even the highly civilised Kelt of France, familiar as he is with theories of political liberty, seems almost incapable of sustaining free institutions. After a moment of constitutional government, he reverts, with a bias which the fatalist might call irresistible, to despotism in some form" (18). The warning so frequently uttered by Burke in his last years, to fly from the liberty of France, is still more needful now that French liberty has exhibited itself in a far more seductive light. The danger is more subtle, when able men confound political forms with popular rights. France has never been governed by a Constitution since 1792, if by a Constitution is meant a definite rule and limitation of the governing power. It is not that the French failed to preserve the forms of parliamentary government, but that those forms no more implied freedom than the glory which the Empire has twice given in their stead. It is a serious fault in our author that he has not understood so essential a distinction. Has he not read the *Rights of Man* by Tom Paine? "It is not because a part of the government is elective that makes it less a despotism, if the persons so elected possess afterwards, as a parliament, unlimited powers. Election, in this case, becomes separated from representation, and the candidates are candidates for despotism."* Napoleon once consulted the cleverest among the politicians who served him, respecting the durability of some of his institutions. "Ask yourself," was the answer, "what it would cost you to destroy them. If the destruction would cost no effort, you have created nothing; for politically, as well as physically, only that which resists endures." In the year 1802 the same great writer said: "Nothing is more pernicious in a monarchy than the principles and the forms of democracy, for they allow no alternative but despotism and revolutions." With the additional experience of half a century, a writer not inferior to the last repeats exactly the same idea. "Of all societies in the world, those which will always have most difficulty in permanently escaping absolute government will be precisely those societies in which aristocracy is no more, and can no more be."† French Constitutionalism was but a form by which the absence of self-government was concealed. The State was as despotic under Villèle or Guizot as under either of the Bonapartes. The Restoration fenced itself round with artificial

* Works, ii. 47. This is one of the passages which, seventy years ago, were declared to be treasonable. We trust we run no risk in confessing that we entirely agree with it.

† Tocqueville, *L'Ancien Régime et la Révolution*, préface, p. xvi.

creations, having no root in the condition or in the sympathies of the people; these creations simply weakened it by making it unpopular. The hereditary peerage was an anomaly in a country unused to primogeniture, and so was the revival in a nation of sceptics of the Gallican union between Church and State. The monarchy of July, which was more suited to the nature of French society, and was thus enabled to crush a series of insurrections, was at last forced, by its position and by the necessity of self-preservation, to assume a very despotic character. After the fortifications of Paris were begun, a tendency set in, which under a younger sovereign would have led to a system hardly distinguishable from that which now prevails; and there are princes in the House of Orleans whose government would develop the principle of democracy in a manner not very remote from the institutions of the second Empire. It is liberalism more than despotism that is opposed to liberty in France; and it is a most dangerous error to imagine that the government of the French charter really resembled ours. There are States without any parliament at all, whose principles and fundamental institutions are in much closer harmony with our system of autonomy. Mr. Goldwin Smith sees half the truth, that there is something in the French nation which incapacitates it for liberty; but he does not see that what they have always sought, and sometimes enjoyed, is not freedom; that their liberty must diminish in proportion as their ideal is attained; and that they are not yet familiar with the theory of political rights.

With this false notion of what constitutes liberty, it is not surprising that he should repeatedly dwell on its connexion with Protestantism, and talk of "the political liberty which Protestantism brought in its train" (120). Such phrases may console a Protestant reader of a book fatal to the Protestant ascendancy in Ireland; but as there are no arguments in support of them, and as they are strangely contradicted by the facts in the context, Mr. Goldwin Smith resorts to the ingenious artifice of calling to mind as many ugly stories about Catholics as he can. The notion constantly recurs that, though the Protestants were very wicked in Ireland, it was against their principles and general practice, and is due to the Catholics, whose system naturally led them to be tyrannical and cruel, and thus provoked retaliation. Mr. Smith might have been reminded by Peter Plymley that when Protestantism has had its own way, it has uniformly been averse to freedom: "What has Protestantism done for liberty in Denmark, in Sweden, throughout the north of

Germany, and in Prussia?" Not much less than democracy has done in France. An admirer of the constitutions of 1791, 1814, or 1830, may be excused if he is not very severe on the absolutism of Protestant countries.

Mr. Goldwin Smith mistakes the character of the invasion of Ireland because he has not understood the relative position of the civilisation of the two countries at the time when it occurred. That of the Celts was in many respects more refined than that of the Normans. The Celts are not among the progressive, initiative races, but among those which supply the materials rather than the impulse of history, and are either stationary or retrogressive. The Persians, the Greeks, the Romans, and the Teutons, are the only makers of history, the only authors of advancement. Other races, possessing a highly developed language, a copious literature, a speculative religion, enjoying luxury and art, attain to a certain pitch of cultivation which they are unable either to communicate or to increase. They are a negative element in the world; sometimes the barrier, sometimes the instrument, sometimes the material, of those races to whom it is given to originate and to advance. Their existence is either passive, or reactionary and destructive, when, after intervening like the blind forces of nature, they speedily exhibit their uncreative character, and leave others to pursue the course to which they have pointed. The Chinese are a people of this kind. They have long remained stationary, and succeeded in excluding the influences of general history. So the Hindoos; being Pantheists, they have no history of their own, but supply objects for commerce and for conquest. So the Huns, whose appearance gave a sudden impetus to a stagnant world. So the Slavonians, who tell only in the mass, and whose influence is ascertainable sometimes by adding to the momentum of active forces, sometimes by impeding through inertness the progress of mankind. To this class of nations also belong the Celts of Gaul. The Roman and the German conquerors have not altered their character as it was drawn two thousand years ago. They have a history, but it is not theirs; their nature remains unchanged, their history is the history of the invaders. The revolution was the revival of the conquered race, and their reaction against the creations of their masters. But it has been cunning only to destroy; it has not given life to one constructive idea, or durability to one new institution; and it has exhibited to the world an unparalleled political incapacity, which was announced by Burke, and analysed by Tocqueville, in works which are the crowning pieces of two great literatures.

The Celts of these islands, in like manner, waited for a foreign influence to set in action the rich treasures which in their own hands could be of no avail. Their language was more flexible, their poetry and music more copious, than those of the Anglo-Normans. Their laws, if we may judge from those of Wales, display a society in some respects highly cultivated. But, like the rest of that group of nations to which they belong, there was not in them the incentive to action and progress which is given by the consciousness of a part in human destiny, by the inspiration of a high idea, or even by the natural development of institutions. Their life and literature were aimless and wasteful. Without combination or concentration, they had no star to guide them in an onward course; and the progress of dawn into day was no more to them than to the flocks and to the forests. Before the Danish wars, and the decay which is described by St. Bernard, in terms which must not be taken quite literally, had led to the English invasion, there was probably as much material, certainly as much spiritual, culture in Ireland as in any country in the West; but there was not that by whose sustaining force alone these things endure, by which alone the place of nations in history is determined—there was no political civilisation. The State did not keep pace with the progress of society. This is the essential and decisive inferiority of the Celtic race, as conspicuous among the Irish in the twelfth century as among the French in our own. They gave way before the higher political aptitude of the English.

The issue of an invasion is generally decided by this political aptitude, and the consequences of conquest always depend on it. Subjection to a people of a higher capacity for government is of itself no misfortune; and it is to most countries the condition of their political advancement. The Greeks were more highly cultivated than the Romans, the Gauls than the Franks; yet in both cases the higher political intelligence prevailed. For a long time the English had, perhaps, no other superiority over the Irish; yet this alone would have made the conquest a great blessing to Ireland, but for the separation of the races. Conquering races necessarily bring with them their own system of government, and there is no other way of introducing it. A nation can obtain political education only by dependence on another. Art, literature, and science may be communicated by the conquered to the conqueror; but government can be taught only by governing, therefore only by the governors; politics can only be learnt in this school. The most un-

civilised of the barbarians, whilst they slowly and imperfectly learned the arts of Rome, at once remodeled its laws. The two kinds of civilisation, social and political, are wholly unconnected with each other. Either may subsist, in high perfection, alone. Polity grows like language, and is part of a people's nature, not dependent on its will. One or the other can be developed, modified, corrected; but they cannot be subverted or changed by the people itself without an act of suicide. Organic change, if it comes at all, must come from abroad. Revolution is a malady, a frenzy, an interruption of the nation's growth, sometimes fatal to its existence, often to its independence. In this case, revolution, by making the nation subject to others, may be the occasion of a new development. But it is not conceivable that a nation should arbitrarily and spontaneously cast off its history, reject its traditions, abrogate its laws and government, and commence a new political existence. Nothing in the experience of ages, or in the nature of man, allows us to believe that the attempt of France to establish a durable edifice on the ruins of 1789, without using the old materials, can ever succeed, or that she can ever emerge from the vicious circle of the last seventy years, except by returning to the principle which she then repudiated, and by admitting, that if States would live, they must preserve their organic connexion with their origin and history, which are their root and their stem; that they are not voluntary creations of human wisdom; and that men labour in vain who would construct them without acknowledging God as the artificer.

Theorists who hold it to be a wrong that a nation should belong to a foreign state are therefore in contradiction with the law of civil progress. This law, or rather necessity, which is as absolute as the law that binds society together, is the force which makes us need one another, and only enables us to obtain what we need on terms, not of equality, but of dominion and subjection, in domestic, economic, or political relations. The political theory of nationality is in contradiction with the historic notion. Since a nation derives its ideas and instincts of government, as much as its temperament and its language, from God, acting through the influences of nature and of history, these ideas and instincts are originally and essentially peculiar to it, and not separable from it. They have no practical value in themselves when divided from the capacity which corresponds to them. National qualities are the incarnations of political ideas. No people can receive its government from another without

receiving at the same time the ministers of government. The workman must travel with the work. Such changes can only be accomplished by submission to a foreign state, or to another race.

Europe has seen two great instances of such conquests, extending over centuries,—the Roman empire, and the settlement of the barbarians in the West. This it is which gives unity to the history of the Middle Ages. The Romans established a universal empire by subjecting all countries to the authority of a single power. The barbarians introduced into all a single system of law, and thus became the instrument of a universal Church. The same spirit of freedom, the same notions of the State, pervade all the *Leges Barbarorum*, and all the polities they founded in Europe and Asia. They differ widely in the surrounding conditions, in the state of society, in the degree of advancement, in almost all external things. The principle common to them all is to acknowledge the freedom of the Church as a corporation and a proprietor, and in virtue of the principle of self-government to allow religion to develop her influence in the State. The great migration which terminated in the Norman conquests and in the Crusades gave the dominion of the Latin world to the Teutonic chivalry, and to the Church her proper place. All other countries sank into despotism, into schism, and at last into barbarism, under the Tartars or the Turks. The union between the Teutonic races and the Holy See was founded on their political qualities more than on their religious fervour. In modern times, the most pious Catholics have often tyrannised over the Church. In the Middle Ages, her liberty was often secured and respected where her spiritual injunctions were least obeyed.

The growth of the feudal system coinciding with the general decay of morals led, in the eleventh century, to new efforts of the Church to preserve her freedom. The Holy See was delivered from the Roman factions by the most illustrious of the emperors, and a series of German Popes commenced the great reform. Other princes were unwilling to submit to the authority of the imperial nominees, and the kings of France and Castile showed symptoms of resistance, in which they were supported by the heresy of Berengarius. The conduct of Henry IV. delivered the Church from the patronage of the empire, whilst the Normans defended her against the Gallican tendencies and the feudal tyranny. In Sicily, the Normans consented to hold their power from the Pope; and in Normandy, Berengarius found a successful adversary, and the king of France a vassal who compelled

him to abandon his designs. The chaplain of the Conqueror describes his government in terms which show how singularly it fulfilled the conditions which the Church requires. He tells us that William established in Normandy a truly Christian order ; that every village, town, and castle enjoyed its own privileges ; and that, while other princes either forbade the erection of churches or seized their endowments, he left his subjects free to make pious gifts. In his reign and by his conduct the word 'bigot' ceased to be a term of reproach, and came to signify what we now should call 'ultramontane.' He was the foremost of those Normans who were called by the Holy See to reclaim what was degenerate, and to renovate the declining states of the North.

Where the Church addressed herself to the conversion of races of purely Teutonic origin, as in Scandinavia, her missionaries achieved the work. In other countries, as in Poland and Hungary, political dependence on the Empire was the channel and safeguard of her influence. The Norman conquest of England and of Ireland differs from all of these. In both islands the faith had been freely preached, adopted, and preserved. The rulers and the people were Catholic. The last Saxon king who died before the Conquest was a saint. The last Archbishop of Dublin appointed before the invasion was a saint. Neither of the invasions can be explained simply by the demoralisation of the clergy, or by the spiritual destitution of the people.

Catholicism spreads among the nations, not only as a doctrine, but as an institution. "The Church," says Mr. Goldwin Smith, "is not a disembodied spirit, but a spirit embodied in human society." Her teaching is directed to the inner man, and is confined to the social order ; but her discipline touches on the political. She cannot permanently ignore the acts and character of the State, or escape its notice. Whilst she preaches submission to authorities ordained by God, her nature, not her interest, compels her to exert an involuntary influence upon them. The jealousy so often exhibited by governments is not without reason, for the free action of the Church is the test of the free constitution of the State ; and without such free constitution there must necessarily ensue either persecution or revolution. Between the settled organisation of Catholicism and every form of arbitrary power, there is an incompatibility which must terminate in conflict. In a State which possesses no security for authority or freedom, the Church must either fight or succumb. Now as authority and freedom, the conditions of her existence, can only be obtained through

the instrumentality of certain nations, she depends on the aid of these nations. Religion alone cannot civilise men, or secure its own conquests. It promotes civilisation where it has power; but it has not power where its way is not prepared. Its civilising influence is chiefly indirect, and acts by its needs and wants as much as by the fulness of its ideas. So Christianity extends itself by the aid of the secular power, relying, not on the victories of Christian arms, but on the progress of institutions and ideas that harmonise with ecclesiastical freedom. Hence, those who have most actively served the interests of the Church are not always those who have been most faithful to her doctrines. The work which the Goth and the Frank had done on the continent of Europe, the Normans came to do in England, where it had been done before but had failed, and in Ireland, where neither Roman nor German influences had entered.

Thus the theory of nationality, unknown to Catholic ages, is inconsistent both with political reason and with Christianity, which requires the dominion of race over race, and whose path was made straight by two universal empires. The missionary may outstrip, in his devoted zeal, the progress of trade or of arms; but the seed that he plants will not take root, unprotected by those ideas of right and duty which first came into the world with the tribes who destroyed the civilisation of antiquity, and whose descendants are in our day carrying those ideas to every quarter of the world. It was as impossible to realise in Ireland the medieval notions of ecclesiastical liberty, without a great political reform, as to put an end to the dissolution of society and the feuds of princes, without the authority of a supreme lord.

There is one institution of those days to which Mr. Goldwin Smith has not done entire justice. "It is needless to say that the Eric, or pecuniary composition for blood, in place of capital or other punishment, which the Brehon law sanctioned, is the reproach of all primitive codes, and of none. It is the first step from the license of savage revenge to the ordered justice of a regular law" (41). Pecuniary composition for blood belongs to an advanced period of defined and regular criminal jurisprudence. In the lowest form of civil society, when the State is not yet distinct from the family, the family is compelled to defend itself; and the only protection of society is the *vendetta*. It is the private right of self-defence combined with the public office of punishment; and therefore not only a privilege, but an

obligation. The whole family is bound to avenge the injury; but the duty rests first of all with the heir. Precedency in the office of avenger is naturally connected with a first claim in inheritance; and the succession to property is determined by the law of revenge. This leads both to primogeniture, because the eldest son is most likely to be capable of punishing the culprit, and, for the same reason, to modifications of primogeniture, by the preference of the brother before the grandson, and of the male line before the female. A practice which appears barbarous is, therefore, one of the foundations of civilisation, and the origin of some of the refinements of law. In this state of society, there is no distinction between civil and criminal law; an injury is looked upon as a private wrong, not, as religion considers it, a sin, or, as the State considers it, a crime.

Something very similar occurs in feudal society. Here all the barons were virtually equal to each other, and without any superior to punish their crimes or to avenge their wrongs. They were, therefore, compelled to obtain safety or reparation, like sovereigns, by force of arms. What war is among states, the feud is in feudal society, and the vengeance of blood in societies not yet matured into states—a substitute for the fixed administration of justice.

The assumption of this duty by the State begins with the recognisance of acts done against the State itself. At first, political crimes alone are visited with a public penalty; private injuries demand no public expiation, but only satisfaction of the injured party. This appears in its most rudimentary form in the *lex talionis*. Society requires that punishment should be inflicted by the state, in order to prevent continual disorders. If the injured party could be satisfied and his duty fulfilled without inflicting on the criminal an injury corresponding to that which he had done, society was obviously the gainer. At first it was optional to accept or to refuse satisfaction; afterwards it was made obligatory. Where property was so valuable that its loss was visited on the life or limb of the robber, and injuries against property were made a question of life and death, it soon followed that injury to life could be made a question of payment. To expiate robbery by death, and to expiate murder by the payment of a fine, are correlative ideas. Practically this custom often told with a barbarous inequality against those who were too poor to purchase forgiveness; but it was otherwise both just and humane in principle, and it was generally encouraged by the Church. For in her eyes the criminal was guilty of an act of which it was necessary that

he should repent ; this made her desire, not his destruction, but his conversion. She tried, therefore, to save his life, and to put an end to revenge, mutilation, and servitude ; and for all this the alternative was compensation. This purpose was served by the right of asylum. The Church surrendered the fugitive only on condition that his life and person should be spared in consideration of a lawful fine, which she often paid for him herself. *Concedatur ei vita et omnia membra. Emendat autem causam in quantum poterit*, says a law of Charlemagne, given in the year 785, when the influence of religion on legislation was most powerful in Europe.

No idea occurs more frequently in the work we are reviewing than that of the persecuting character of the Catholic Church ; it is used as a perpetual apology for the penal laws in Ireland. "When the Catholics writhe under this wrong, let them turn their eyes to the history of Catholic countries, and remember that, while the Catholic Church was stripped of her endowments and doomed to political degradation by Protestant persecutors in Ireland, the Protestant Churches were exterminated with fire and sword by Catholic persecutors in France, Austria, Flanders, Italy, and Spain" (92). He speaks of Catholicism as "a religion which all Protestants believed to be idolatrous, and knew by fearful experience to be persecuting" (113). "It would not be difficult to point to persecuting laws more sanguinary than these. Spain, France, and Austria will at once supply signal examples. . . . That persecution was the vice of an age and not only of a particular religion, that it disgraced Protestantism as well as Catholicism, is true. But no one who reads the religious history of Europe with an open mind can fail to perceive that the persecutions carried on by Protestants were far less bloody and less extensive than those carried on by Catholics ; that they were more frequently excusable as acts of retaliation ; that they arose more from political alarm, and less from the spirit of the religion ; and that the temper of their authors yielded more rapidly to the advancing influence of humanity and civilisation" (127, 129).

All these arguments are fallacies ; but as the statements at the same time are full of error, we believe that the author is wrong because he has not studied the question, not because he has designed to misrepresent it. The fact that he does not distinguish from each other the various kinds and occasions of persecution, proves that he is wholly ignorant of the things with which it is connected.

Persecution is the vice of particular religions, and the misfortune of particular stages of political society. It is the resource by which States that would be subverted by religious liberty escape the more dangerous alternative of imposing religious disabilities. The exclusion of a part of the community by reason of its faith from the full benefit of the law is a danger and disadvantage to every State, however highly organised its constitution may otherwise be. But the actual existence of a religious party differing in faith from the majority is dangerous only to a State very imperfectly organised. Disabilities are always a danger. Multiplicity of religions is only dangerous to States of an inferior type. By persecution they rid themselves of the peculiar danger which threatens them, without involving themselves in a system universally bad. Persecution comes naturally in a certain period of the progress of society, before a more flexible and comprehensive system has been introduced by that advance of religion and civilisation whereby Catholicism gradually penetrates into hostile countries, and Christian powers acquire dominion over infidel populations. Thus it is the token of an epoch in the political, religious, and intellectual life of mankind, and it disappears with its epoch, and with the advance of the Church militant in her Catholic vocation.

Intolerance of dissent and impatience of contradiction are a characteristic of youth. Those that have no knowledge of the truth that underlies opposite opinions, and no experience of their consequent force, cannot believe that men are sincere in holding them. At a certain point of mental growth, tolerance implies indifference, and intolerance is inseparable from sincerity. Thus intolerance, in itself a defect, becomes in this case a merit. Again, although the political conditions of intolerance belong to the youth and immaturity of nations, the motives of intolerance may at any time be just, and the principle high. For the theory of religious unity is founded on the most elevated and truest view of the character and function of the State, on the perception that its ultimate purpose is not distinct from that of the Church. In the pagan state they were identified; in the Christian world the end remains the same, but the means are different. The State aims at the things of another life, but indirectly. Its course runs parallel to that of the Church; they do not converge. The direct subservience of the State to religious ends would imply despotism and persecution just as much as the pagan supremacy of civil over religious authority. The similarity of the end demands harmony in the principles, and creates a decided antagonism between

the State and a religious community whose character is in total contradiction with it. With such religions there is no possibility of reconciliation. A State must be at open war with any system which it sees would prevent it from fulfilling its legitimate duties. The danger, therefore, lies not in the doctrine, but in the practice. But to the pagan and to the medieval state, the danger was in the doctrine. The Christians were the best subjects of the emperor, but Christianity was really subversive of the fundamental institutions of the Roman Empire. In the infancy of the modern states, the civil power required all the help that religion could give in order to establish itself against the lawlessness of barbarism and feudal dissolution. The existence of the State at that time depended on the power of the Church. When, in the thirteenth century, the Empire renounced this support, and made war on the Church, it fell at once into a number of small sovereignties. In those cases persecution was self-defence. It was wrongly defended as an absolute, not as a conditional principle; but such a principle was false only as the modern theory of religious liberty is false. One was a wrong generalisation from the true character of the State; the other is a true conclusion from a false notion of the State. To say that because of the union between Church and State it is right to persecute, would condemn all toleration; and to say that the objects of the State have nothing to do with religion, would condemn all persecution. But persecution and toleration are equally true in principle, considered politically; only one belongs to a more highly developed civilisation than the other. At one period toleration would destroy society; at another, persecution is fatal to liberty. The theory of intolerance is wrong only if founded absolutely upon religious motives; but even then the practice of it is not necessarily censurable. It is opposed to the Christian spirit, in the same manner as slavery is opposed to it; the Church prohibits neither intolerance nor slavery, though in proportion as her influence extends, and civilisation advances, both gradually disappear.

Unity and liberty are the only legitimate principles on which the position of a Church in a State can be regulated, but the distance between them is immeasurable, and the transition extremely difficult. To pass from religious unity to religious liberty is to effect a complete inversion in the character of the State, a change in the whole spirit of legislation, and a still greater revolution in the minds and habits of men. So great a change seldom happens all at once. The law naturally follows the condition of society,

which does not suddenly change. An intervening stage from unity to liberty, a compromise between toleration and persecution, is a common but irrational, tyrannical, and impolitic arrangement. It is idle to talk of the guilt of persecution, if we do not distinguish the various principles on which religious dissent can be treated by the State. The exclusion of other religions—the system of Spain, of Sweden, of Mecklenburg, Holstein, and Tyrol—is reasonable in principle, though practically untenable in the present state of European society. The system of expulsion or compulsory conformity, adopted by Lewis XIV. and the Emperor Nicholas, is defensible neither on religious nor political grounds. But the system applied to Ireland, which uses religious disabilities for the purpose of political oppression,* stands alone in solitary infamy among the crimes and follies of the rulers of men.

The acquisition of real definite freedom is a very slow and tardy process. The great social independence enjoyed in the early periods of national history is not yet political freedom. The State has not yet developed its authority, or assumed the functions of government. A period follows when all the action of society is absorbed by the ruling power, when the license of early times is gone, and the liberties of a riper age are not yet acquired. These liberties are the product of a long conflict with absolutism, and of a gradual development, which, by establishing definite rights, revives in positive form the negative liberty of an unformed society. The object and the result of this process is the organisation of self-government, the substitution of right for force, of authority for power, of duty for necessity, and of a moral for a physical relation between government and people. Until this point is reached, religious liberty is an anomaly. In a State which possesses all power and all authority there is no room for the autonomy of religious communities. Those States, therefore, not only refuse liberty of

* "From what I have observed, it is pride, arrogance, and a spirit of domination, and not a bigoted spirit of religion, that has caused and kept up those oppressive statutes. I am sure I have known those who have oppressed Papists in their civil rights exceedingly indulgent to them in their religious ceremonies, and who really wished them to continue Catholics, in order to furnish pretences for oppression. These persons never saw a man (by converting) escape out of their power but with grudging and regret." Burke, "On the Penal Laws against Irish Catholics," *Works*, iv. 505.

"I vow to God, I would sooner bring myself to put a man to immediate death for opinions I disliked, and so to get rid of the man and his opinions at once, than to fret him into a feverish being, tainted with the jail-distemper of a contagious servitude, to keep him above ground, an animated mass of putrefaction, corrupted himself and corrupting all about him." Speech at Bristol, *ib.* iii. 427.

conscience, but deprive the favoured Church of ecclesiastical freedom. The principles of religious unity and liberty are so opposed that no modern State has at once denied toleration and allowed freedom to its established Church. Both of these are unnatural in a State which rejects self-government, the only secure basis of all freedom, whether religious or political. For religious freedom is based on political liberty ; intolerance, therefore, is a political necessity against all religions which threaten the unity of faith in a State that is not free, and in every State against those religions which threaten its existence. Absolute intolerance belongs to the absolute State ; special persecution may be justified by special causes in any State. All medieval persecution is of the latter kind, for the sects against which it was directed were revolutionary parties. The State really defended, not its religious unity, but its political existence.

If the Catholic Church was naturally inclined to persecute, she would persecute in all cases alike, when there was no interest to serve but her own. Instead of adapting her conduct to circumstances, and accepting theories according to the character of the time, she would have developed a consistent theory out of her own system, and would have been most severe when she was most free from external influences, from political objects, or from temporary or national prejudices. She would have imposed a common rule of conduct in different countries in different ages, instead of submitting to the exigencies of each time and place. Her own rule of conduct never changed. She treats it as a crime to abandon her, not so to be outside her. An apostate who returns to her has a penance for his apostasy ; a heretic who is converted has no penance for his heresy. Severity against those who are outside her fold is against her principles. Persecution is contrary to the nature of a universal Church ; it is peculiar to the national Churches.

While the Catholic Church by her progress in freedom naturally tends to push the development of States beyond the sphere where they are still obliged to preserve the unity of religion, and whilst she extends over States in all degrees of advancement, Protestantism, which belongs to a particular age and state of society, which makes no claim to universality, and which is dependent on political connection, regards persecution, not as an accident, but as a duty. Wherever Protestantism prevailed, intolerance became a principle of State, and was proclaimed in theory even where the Protestants were in a minority, and where the theory supplied a weapon against themselves. The Reformation made it a

general law, not only against Catholics by way of self-defence or retaliation, but against all who dissented from the reformed doctrines, whom it treated, not as enemies, but as criminals,—against the Protestant sects, against Socinians, and against atheists. It was not a right, but a duty; its object was to avenge God, not to preserve order. There is no analogy between the persecution which preserves, and the persecution which attacks; or between intolerance as a religious duty, and intolerance as a necessity of State. The Reformers unanimously declared persecution to be incumbent on the civil power; and the Protestant governments universally acted upon their injunctions, until scepticism escaped the infliction of penal laws and condemned their spirit.

Doubtless, in the interest of their religion, they acted wisely. Freedom is not more decidedly the natural condition of Catholicism than intolerance is of Protestantism; which by the help of persecution succeeded in establishing itself in countries where it had no root in the affections of the people, and in preserving itself from the internal divisions which follow free inquiry. Toleration has been at once a cause and an effect of its decline. The Catholic Church, on the other hand, supported the medieval State by religious unity, and has saved herself in the modern State by religious freedom. No longer compelled to devise theories in justification of a system imposed on her by the exigencies of half-organised societies, she is enabled to revert to a policy more suited to her nature and to her most venerable traditions; and the principle of liberty has already restored to her much of that which the principle of unity took away. It was not, as our author imagines (119), by the protection of Lewis XIV. that she was formidable; nor is it true that in consequence of the loss of temporalities “the chill of death is gathering round the heart of the great theocracy” (94); nor that “the visible decline of the papacy” is at hand because it no longer wields “the more efficacious arms of the great Catholic monarchies” (190). The same appeal to force, the same principles of intolerance which expelled Catholicism from Protestant countries, gave rise in Catholic countries to the growth of infidelity. The Revolutions of 1789 in France, and of 1859 in Italy, attest the danger of a practice which requires for its support the doctrines of another religion, or the circumstances of a different age. Not till the Church had lost those props in which Mr. Goldwin Smith sees the secret of her power, did she recover her elasticity and her expansive vigour. Catholics may have learnt this truth late; but Protestants, it appears, have yet to learn it.

In one point Mr. Goldwin Smith is not so very far from the views of the Orange party. He thinks, indeed, that the Church is no longer dangerous, and would not therefore have Catholics maltreated ; but this is due, not to her merits, but to her weakness. "Popes might now be as willing as ever, if they had the power, to step between a Protestant State and the allegiance of its subjects" (190). Mr. Smith seems to think that the Popes claim the same authority over the rulers of a Protestant State that they formerly possessed over the princes of Catholic countries. Yet this political power of the Holy See was never a universal right of jurisdiction over States, but a special and positive right, which it is as absurd to censure as to fear or to regret at the present time. Directly, it extended only over territories which were held by feudal tenure of the Pope, like the Sicilian monarchy. Elsewhere the authority was indirect, not political, but religious, and its political consequences were due to the laws of the land. The Catholic countries would no more submit to a king not of their communion than Protestant countries, England, for instance, or Denmark. This is as natural and inevitable in a country where the whole population is of one religion, as it is artificial and unjust in a country where no sort of religious unity prevails, and where such a law might compel the sovereign to be of the religion of the minority. At any rate, nobody who thinks it reasonable that any prince abandoning the Established Church should forfeit the English throne, can complain of a law which compelled the sovereign to be of the religion, not of a majority, but of the whole of his subjects. The idea of the Pope stepping between a State and the allegiance of its subjects is a mere misapprehension. The instrument of his authority is the law, and the law resides in the State. The Pope could intervene, therefore, only between the State and the occupant of the throne; and his intervention suspended, not the duty of obeying, but the right of governing. The line on which his sentence ran separated, not the subjects from the State, but the sovereign from the other authorities. It was addressed to the nation politically organised against the head of the organism, not to the mass of individual subjects against the constituted authorities. That such a power was inconsistent with the modern notion of sovereignty is true ; but it is also true that this notion is as much at variance with the nature of ecclesiastical authority as with civil liberty. The Roman maxim, *princeps legibus solutus*, could not be admitted by the Church ; and an absolute prince could not properly be invested in her eyes with the sanctity of

authority, or protected by the duty of submission. A moral, and *à fortiori* a spiritual, authority moves and lives only in an atmosphere of freedom.

There are, however, two things to be considered in explanation of the error into which our author and so many others have fallen. Law follows life, but not with an equal pace. There is a time when it ceases to correspond to the existing order of things, and meets an invincible obstacle in a new society. The exercise of the medieval authority of the Popes was founded on the religious unity of the State, and had no basis in a divided community. It was not easy in the period of transition to tell when the change took place, and at what moment the old power lost its efficacy; no one could foresee its failure, and it still remained the legal and recognised means of preventing the change. Accordingly it was twice tried during the wars of religion, in France with success, in England with disastrous effects. It is a universal rule that a right is not given up until the necessity of its surrender is proved. But the real difficulty arises, not from the mode in which the power was exercised, but from the way in which it was defended. The medieval writers were accustomed to generalise; they disregarded particular circumstances, and they were generally ignorant of the habits and ideas of their age. Living in the cloister, and writing for the school, they were unacquainted with the polity and institutions around them, and sought their authorities and examples in antiquity, in the speculations of Aristotle, and the maxims of the civil law. They gave to their political doctrines as abstract a form, and attributed to them as universal an application, as the modern absolutists or the more recent liberals. So regardless were they of the difference between ancient times and their own, that the Jewish chronicles, the Grecian legislators, and the Roman code supplied them indifferently with rules and instances; they could not imagine that a new state of things would one day arise in which their theories would be completely obsolete. Their definitions of right and law are absolute in the extreme, and seem often to admit of no qualification. Hence their character is essentially revolutionary, and they contradict both the authority of law and the security of freedom. It is on this contradiction that the common notion of the danger of ecclesiastical pretensions is founded. But the men who take alarm at the tone of the medieval claims judge them with a theory just as absolute and as excessive. No man can fairly denounce imaginary pretensions in the Church of the nineteenth century, who does not un-

derstand that rights which are now impossible may have been reasonable and legitimate in the days when they were actually exercised.

The zeal with which Mr. Goldwin Smith condemns the Irish establishment and the policy of the Ascendency is all the more meritorious because he has no conception of the amount of iniquity involved in them. "The State Church of Ireland, however anomalous and even scandalous its position may be as the Church of a dominant majority upheld by force in the midst of a hostile people, does not, in truth, rest on a principle different from that of other State Churches. To justify the existence of any State Church, it must be assumed as an axiom that the State is the judge of religious truth; and that it is bound to impose upon its subjects, or at least to require them as a community to maintain, the religion which it judges to be true" (91). No such analogy in reality subsists as is here assumed. There is a great difference between the Irish and the English establishment; but even the latter has no similarity of principle with the Catholic establishments of the Continent.

The fundamental distinction is, that in one case the religion of the people is adopted by the State, whilst in the other the State imposes a religion on the people. For the political justification of Catholic establishments, no more is required than the theory that it is just that the religion of a country should be represented in, and protected by, its government. This is evidently and universally true; for the moral basis which human laws require can only be derived from an influence which was originally religious as well as moral. The unity of moral consciousness must be founded on a precedent unity of spiritual belief. According to this theory, the character of the nation determines the forms of the State. Consequently it is a theory consistent with freedom. But Protestant establishments, according to our author's definition, which applies to them, and to them alone, rest on the opposite theory, that the will of the State is independent of the condition of the community; and that it may, or indeed must, impose on the nation a faith which may be that of a minority, and which in some cases has been that of the sovereign alone. According to the Catholic view, government may preserve in its laws, and by its authority, the religion of the community; according to the Protestant view, it may be bound to change it. A government which has power to change the faith of its subjects must be absolute in other things; so that one theory is as favourable to tyranny as the other is opposed to it. The safeguard of the Catholic

system of Church and State, as contrasted with the Protestant, was that very authority which the Holy See used to prevent the sovereign from changing the religion of the people, by deposing him if he departed from it himself.

In most Catholic countries the Church preceded the State; some she assisted to form; all she contributed to sustain. Throughout Western Europe Catholicism was the religion of the inhabitants before the new monarchies were founded. The invaders, who became the dominant race and the architects of a new system of States, were sooner or later compelled, in order to preserve their dominion, to abandon their pagan or their Arian religion, and to adopt the common faith of the immense majority of the people. The connexion between Church and State was therefore a natural, not an arbitrary, institution; the result of the submission of the government to popular influence, and the means by which that influence was perpetuated. No Catholic government ever imposed a Catholic establishment on a Protestant community, or destroyed a Protestant establishment. Even the revocation of the edict of Nantes, the greatest wrong ever inflicted on the Protestant subjects of a Catholic State, will bear no comparison with the establishment of the religion of a minority. It is a far greater wrong than the most severe persecution, because persecution may be necessary for the preservation of an existing society, as in the case of the early Christians and of the Albigenses; but a State Church can only be justified by the acquiescence of the nation. In every other case it is a great social danger, and is inseparable from political oppression.

Mr. Goldwin Smith's vision is bounded by the Protestant horizon. The Irish establishment has one great mark in common with the other Protestant establishments,—that it is the creature of the State, and an instrument of political influence. They were all imposed on the nation by the State power, sometimes against the will of the people, sometimes against that of the crown. By the help of military power and of penal laws, the State strove to provide that the Established Church should not be the religion of the minority. But in Ireland the establishment was introduced too late—when Protestantism had spent its expansive force, and the attraction of its doctrine no longer aided the efforts of the civil power. Its position was false from the beginning, and obliged it to resort to persecution and official proselytism in order to put an end to the anomaly. Whilst, therefore, in all cases, Protestantism became the Established Church by an exercise of authority tyrannical in itself, and possible

only from the absolutism of the ruling power, in Ireland the tyranny of its institution was perpetuated in the system by which it was upheld, and in the violence with which it was introduced; and this tyranny continues through all its existence. It is the religion of the minority, the Church of an alien State, the cause of suffering and of disturbance, an instrument, a creature, and a monument of conquest and of tyranny. It has nothing in common with Catholic establishments, and none of those qualities which, in the Anglican Church, redeem in part the guilt of its origin. This is not, however, the only point on which our author has mistaken the peculiar and enormous character of the evils of Ireland.

With the injustice which generally attends his historical parallels, he compares the policy of the Orange faction to that of the Jacobins in France. "The ferocity of the Jacobins was in a slight degree redeemed by their fanaticism. Their objects were not entirely selfish. They murdered aristocrats, not only because they hated and feared them, but because they wildly imagined them to stand in the way of the social and political millennium, which, according to Rousseau, awaited the acceptance of mankind" (175). No comparison can be more unfair than one which places the pitiless fanaticism of an idea in the same line with the cruelty inspired by a selfish interest. The Reign of Terror is one of the most portentous events in history, because it was the consistent result of the simplest and most acceptable principle of the Revolution; it saved France from the coalition, and it was the greatest attempt ever made to mould the form of a society by force into harmony with a speculative form of government. An explanation which treats self-interest as its primary motive, and judges other elements as merely qualifying it, is ludicrously inadequate.

The Terrorism of Robespierre was produced by the theory of equality, which was not a mere passion, but a political doctrine, and at the same time a national necessity. Political philosophers who, since the time of Hobbes, derive the State from a social compact, necessarily assume that the contracting parties were equal among themselves. By nature, therefore, all men possess equal rights, and a right to equality. The introduction of the civil power and of private property brought inequality into the world. This is opposed to the condition and to the rights of the natural state. The writers of the eighteenth century attributed to this circumstance the evils and sufferings of society. In France, the ruin of the public finances and the misery of the lower

orders were both laid at the door of the classes whose property was exempt from taxation. The endeavours of successive ministers—of Turgot, Necker, and Calonne—to break down the privileges of the aristocracy and of the clergy were defeated by the resistance of the old society. The government attempted to save itself by obtaining concessions from the *Notables*, but without success, and then the great reform which the State was impotent to carry into execution was effected by the people. The destruction of the aristocratic society, which the absolute monarchy had failed to reform, was the object and the triumph of the Revolution; and the Constitution of 1791 declared all men equal, and withdrew the sanction of the law from every privilege.

This system gave only an equality in civil rights, a political equality such as already subsisted in America; but it did not provide against the existence or the growth of those social inequalities by which the distribution of political power might be affected. But the theory of the natural equality of mankind understands equal rights as rights to equal things in the State, and requires not only an abstract equality of rights, but a positive equality of power. The varieties of condition caused by civilisation were so objectionable in the eyes of this school, that Rousseau wrote earnest vindications of natural society, and condemned the whole social fabric of Europe, as artificial, unnatural, and monstrous. His followers laboured to destroy the work of history and the influence of the past, and to institute a natural, reasonable order of things which should dispose all men on an equal level, which no disparity of wealth or education should be permitted to disturb. There were, therefore, two opinions in the revolutionary party. Those who overthrew the monarchy, established the republic, and commenced the war, were content with having secured political and legal equality, and wished to leave the nation in the enjoyment of those advantages which fortune distributes unequally. But the consistent partisans of equality required that nothing should be allowed to raise one man above another. The Girondists wished to preserve liberty, education, and property; but the Jacobins, who held that an absolute equality should be maintained by the despotism of the government over the people, interpreted more justly the democratic principles which were common to both parties; and, fortunately for their country, they triumphed over their illogical and irresolute adversaries. "When the revolutionary movement was once established," says De Maistre, "nothing but Jacobinism could save France."

Three weeks after the fall of the Gironde, the constitution of 1793, by which a purely ideal democracy was instituted, was presented to the French people. Its adoption exactly coincides with the supremacy of Robespierre in the Committee of Public Safety, and with the inauguration of the Reign of Terror. The danger of invasion made the new tyranny possible; but the political doctrine of the Jacobins made it necessary. Robespierre explains the system in his report on the principles of political morality, presented to the Convention at the moment of his greatest power. "If the principle of a popular government in time of peace is virtue, its principle during revolution is virtue and terror combined: virtue, without which terror is pernicious; terror, without which virtue is powerless. Terror is nothing but rapid, severe, inflexible justice; therefore a product of virtue. It is not so much a principle in itself, as a consequence of the universal principle of democracy in its application to the urgent necessities of the country." This is perfectly true. Envy, revenge, fear, were motives by which individuals were induced or enabled to take part in the administration of such a system; but its introduction was not the work of passion, but the inevitable result of a doctrine. The democratic constitution required to be upheld by violence, not only against foreign arms, but against the state of society and the nature of things. The army could not be made its instrument, because the rulers were civilians, and feared, beyond all things, the influence of military officers in the State. Officers were frequently arrested and condemned as traitors, compelled to seek safety in treason, watched and controlled by members of the Convention. In the absence of a military despotism, the revolutionary tribunal was the only resource.

The same theory of an original state of nature, from which the principle of equality was deduced, also taught men where they might find the standard of equality; as civilisation, by means of civil power, education, and wealth, was the source of corruption, the purity of virtue was to be found in the classes which had been least exposed to those disturbing causes. Those who were least tainted by the temptations of civilised society remained in the natural state. This was the definition of the new notion of the people, which became the measure of virtue and of equality. The democratic theory required that the whole nation should be reduced to the level of the lower orders in all those things in which society creates disparity, in order to be raised to the level of that republican virtue which

resides among those who have retained a primitive simplicity by escaping the influence of civilisation.

The form of government and the condition of society must always correspond. Social equality is therefore a postulate of pure democracy. It was necessary that it should exist if the constitution was to stand, and if the great ideal of popular enthusiasm was ever to be realised. The Revolution had begun by altering the social condition of the country; the correction of society by the State had already commenced. It did not, therefore, seem impossible to continue it until the nation should be completely remodeled in conformity with the new principles. The system before which the ancient monarchy had fallen, which was so fruitful of marvels, which was victorious over a more formidable coalition than that which had humbled Lewis XIV., was deemed equal to the task of completing the social changes which had been so extensively begun, and of moulding France according to the new and simple pattern. The equality which was essential to the existence of the new form of government did not in fact exist. Privilege was abolished, but influence remained. All the inequality founded on wealth, education, ability, reputation, even on the virtues of a code different from that of republican morality, presented obstacles to the establishment of the new *régime*, and those who were thus distinguished were necessarily enemies of the State. With perfect reason, all that rose above the common level, or did not conform to the universal rule, was deemed treasonable. The difference between the actual society and the ideal equality was so great that it could be removed only by violence. The great mass of those who perished were really, either by attachment or by their condition, in antagonism with the State. They were condemned, not for particular acts, but for their position, or for acts which denoted, not so much a hostile design, as an incompatible habit. By the *loi des suspects*, which was provoked by this conflict between the form of government and the real state of the country, whole classes, rather than ill-disposed individuals, were declared objects of alarm. Hence the proscription was wholesale. Criminals were judged and executed in categories; and the merits of individual cases were therefore of little account. For this reason, leading men of ability, bitterly hostile to the new system, were saved by Danton; for it was often indifferent who were the victims, provided the group to which they belonged was struck down. The question was not, what crimes has the prisoner committed? but, does he belong to

one of those classes whose existence the republic cannot tolerate? From this point of view, there were not so many unjust judgments pronounced, at least in Paris, as is generally believed. It was necessary to be prodigal of blood, or to abandon the theory of liberty and equality, which had commanded, for a whole generation, the enthusiastic devotion of educated men, and for the truth of which thousands of its believers were ready to die. The truth of that doctrine was tested by a terrible alternative; but the fault lay with those who believed it, not exclusively with those who practised it. There were few who could administer such a system without any other motive but devotion to the idea, or who could retain the coolness and indifference of which St. Just is an extraordinary example. Most of the Terrorists were swayed by fear for themselves, or by the frenzy which is produced by familiarity with slaughter. But this is of small account. The significance of that sanguinary drama lies in the fact, that a political abstraction was powerful enough to make men think themselves right in destroying masses of their countrymen in the attempt to impose it on their country. The horror of that system and its failure have given vitality to the communistic theory. It was unreasonable to attack the effect instead of the cause, and cruel to destroy the proprietor, while the danger lay in the property. For private property necessarily produces that inequality which the Jacobin theory condemned; and the constitution of 1793 could not be maintained by Terrorism without Communism—by proscribing the rich, while riches were tolerated. The Jacobins were guilty of inconsistency, in omitting to attack inequality in its source. Yet no man who admits their theory has a right to complain of their acts. The one proceeded from the other with the inflexible logic of history. The Reign of Terror was nothing else than the reign of those who conceive that liberty and equality can coexist.

One more quotation will sufficiently justify what we have said of the sincerity and ignorance which Mr. Goldwin Smith shows in his remarks on Catholic subjects. After calling the Bull of Adrian IV. "the stumbling-block and the despair of Catholic historians," he proceeds to say: "Are Catholics filled with perplexity at the sight of infallibility sanctioning rapine? They can scarcely be less perplexed by the title which infallibility puts forward to the dominion of Ireland. . . . But this perplexity arises entirely from the assumption, which may be an article of faith, but is not an article of history, that the infallible morality of the Pope has

never changed" (46, 47). It is hard to understand how a man of honour and ability can entertain such notions of the character of the Papacy as these words imply, or where he can have found authorities for so monstrous a caricature. We will only say that infallibility is no attribute of the political system of the Popes, and that the Bulls of Adrian and Alexander are not instances of infallible morality.

Great as the errors which we have pointed out undoubtedly are, the book itself is of real value, and encourages us to form sanguine hopes of the future services of its author to historical science and ultimately to religion. We are hardly just in complaining of Protestant writers who fail to do justice to the Church. There are not very many amongst ourselves who take the trouble to ascertain her real character as a visible institution, or to know how her nature has been shown in her history. We know the doctrine which she teaches; we are familiar with the outlines of her discipline. We know that sanctity is one of her marks, and that beneficence has characterised her influence. In a general way we are confident that historical accusations are as false as dogmatic attacks, and most of us have some notion of the way in which the current imputations are to be met. But as to her principles of action in many important things, how they have varied in course of time, what changes have been effected by circumstances, and what rules have never been broken,—few are at the pains to inquire. As adversaries imagine that in exposing a Catholic they strike Catholicism, and that the defects of the men are imperfections in the institution, and a proof that it is not divine, so we grow accustomed to confound in our defence that which is defective and that which is indefectible, and to discover in the Church merits as self-contradictory as are the accusations of her different foes. At one moment we are told that Catholicism teaches contempt, and therefore neglect, of wealth; at another that it is false to say that the Church does not promote temporal prosperity. If a great point is made against persecution, it will be denied that she is intolerant, whilst at another time it will be argued that heresy and unbelief deserve to be punished.

We cannot be surprised that Protestants do not know the Church better than we do ourselves, or that, while we allow no evil to be spoken of her human elements, those who deem her altogether human should discover in her the defects of human institutions. It is intensely difficult to enter into the spirit of a system not our own. Particular principles and doctrines are easily mastered; but a system

answering all the spiritual cravings, all the intellectual capabilities of man, demands more than a mere mental effort,—a submission of the intellect, an act of faith, a temporary suspension of the critical faculty. This applies not merely to the Christian religion, with its unfathomable mysteries and its inexhaustible fund of truth, but to the fruits of human speculation. Nobody has ever succeeded in writing a history of philosophy without incurring either the reproach that he is a mere historian, incapable of entering into the genius of any system, or a mere metaphysician, who can discern in all other philosophies only the relation they bear to his own. In religion the difficulty is greater still, and greatest of all with Catholicism. For the Church is to be seen, not in books, but in life. No divine can put together the whole body of her doctrine; no canonist the whole fabric of her law; no historian the infinite vicissitudes of her career. The Protestant who wishes to be informed on all these things can be advised to rely on no one manual, on no encyclopædia of her deeds and of her ideas; if he seeks to know what these have been, he must be told to look around. And to one who surveys her teaching and her fortunes through all ages and all lands, ignorant or careless of that which is essential, changeless, and immortal in her, it will not be easy to discern through so much outward change a regular development, amid such variety of forms the unchanging substance, in so many modifications fidelity to constant laws; or to recognise, in a career so chequered with failure, disaster, and suffering, with the apostasy of heroes, the weakness of rulers, and the errors of doctors, the unfailing hand of a heavenly Guide.

Communicated Articles.*

RIO ON CHRISTIAN ART.†

IN the midst of religious and political excitement, there is always some danger that books, even of a superior order,

* The manager of the Catholic school at Belmont has written to us, contradicting a statement made by Mr. Fraser, which was quoted in our last Number, to the effect that the school admits the children of Protestant parents on the distinct pledge of not interfering with their religious opinions. No such pledge is ever given. The children of Protestant parents are not required to go to mass or catechism on Sundays, but on week-days they learn the same catechism and say the same prayers as the Catholic children, no difference whatever being made between them.

† *De l'Art Chrétien.* Par M. Rio. Paris, Hachette, 1861.

may fail to secure the attention they deserve, when they treat of subjects which lie beyond the range of popular feeling. For people are very apt to overlook the identity which underlies the developments of the human mind in different ages, and to attach more importance to the smallest minutiae of existing modes of thought than to the gravest questions which, to those who have never taken the trouble of looking deeper than their external form, seem to belong wholly to the past. This is a disadvantage which M. Rio shares with almost every author in a higher sphere than that of journalism; but he labours under another more peculiarly his own, in the fact, paradoxical as it may sound, of coming late into a field which, as far as I know, he was the first to open to others. For it is not twenty-four years since, by the publication of the first volume of his *Art Chrétien*, he drew attention to the mystical art of Italy, which has since then attracted the labours of so many eminent men in Germany, England, and Italy itself, where thirty years ago Fra Angelico's name was almost forgotten, while it was but little better known in the rest of Europe. Interest, indeed, in the artistic glories of Italy, earlier than the Cinque-Cento, began in stranger countries, and extended itself to the peninsula, where those political predilections which led to the bastard classicality of the French Revolution obtained to a later period than in any other country of Europe. Camuccini, in Rome, carried on the traditions of Gérard and Girodet, though his fine collection of pictures (including, perhaps, the most beautiful landscape ever painted by Titian, and now in the possession of the Duke of Northumberland at Alnwick) testified to his love for masters previous to the Bolognese eclectics, who almost monopolised the admiration of cognoscenti in the earlier years of this century. Of M. Rio it may be said that he has been obscured by the success of the objects of his early enthusiasm; and though, of course, it would be equally impossible and useless to inquire how far the attention of succeeding authors has been awakened by his eloquence, it may be at least allowed, as a proof of his possessing a mind of rare originality, that he prophesied, so to say, beforehand, the enthusiasm which was to bear fruit during the succeeding quarter of a century. For example, the reasons given in the *Art Chrétien* for the hero-worship of Savonarola are certainly not the same as those which have led one English biographer to dedicate a huge volume to his memory, as a Protestant martyr; or the Prussian government to dedicate a statue to him as an attendant upon Luther's monument at Worms; or again, Count Cavour

to quote him in conjunction with Arnold of Brescia ; but the feeling which dictated them was more original and spontaneous, and the facts on which it rested were historically more correct. I may be permitted to doubt whether the hero-worship of more than one celebrated author will prove equally lasting.

One consequence, however, of the attention won by M. Rio's first volume, and of the long silence which followed it, has been that he has had no opportunity of rectifying the mistakes of those who have represented him as being, not only an altogether exclusive admirer of the Christian ideal which excited his early enthusiasm, but as being wholly unable to appreciate any other. In England, where, from the more settled state of political and social questions, as well as from the more travelled tastes of a large class of the people, M. Rio's early work had perhaps the largest circle of readers, this has been especially the case. The late Mrs. Jameson, who did so much to animate and popularise the feeling of art in England, was long and intimately acquainted with him, and may be named consequently as the most correct of his English critics ; but to those who were aware of his extreme admiration for the masterpieces of Greek art, who had visited with him the galleries of the Vatican, the Capitol, the Uffizj, the Louvre, and the Elgin Marbles of the British Museum, there was something ridiculous, as well as provoking, in even the partial appreciation of other English writers ; while, nevertheless, it was undeniable that their caricatures of his meaning were, in some degree at least, a natural consequence of his unfortunately lengthened silence after the publication of his first volume. In these days of competition, an author must not be the victim of ill-health, under pain of being not only supplanted, but misrepresented, because misunderstood. So entirely was this the case in the instance before us, that it had, by a curious transition from the known to the unknown, led to the fact, that when, a few years ago, a translation of M. Rio's first volume appeared, the death of its author was adverted to in a note as having prevented the completion of his work, with regrets that he had not lived to classify and fill-in the other schools of art in Italy, to the level of the eloquent pages devoted to the Florence of Savonarola and the Venice of Bellini. The inaugurator of a revival is always sure to be taken to task by those who were, to a certain extent, his own disciples ; and the attention of many, once turned into a given direction, has added, during the last twenty years, such various and important materials

to the history of art, that a writer on it to-day occupies a totally different stand-point to that which was necessary when addressing a comparatively ignorant and indifferent class of readers. An orator who is sure of the sympathetic attention of his audience can afford to discriminate and distinguish in a way which would only confuse a less instructed circle; and it needed the able Introduction to the present three volumes of M. Rio's work to reintroduce us fitly to the higher level of artistic knowledge developed during the last quarter of a century. This Introduction strikes me as the most masterly portion of the book, resuming, as it does, in less than a hundred pages, the fruit of the studies of a lifetime, and containing the ripened artistic creed of the author,—the idea of his work,—just as the tympanum and frieze of an old Greek temple showed forth the character of instruction and worship carried on within. This, indeed, is an advantage that belongs to the continental plan of introductions, and is one which, in my opinion, quite counterbalances their occasional abuse; their absence involving a frequent sacrifice of either unity of aim or width of reach, from that confusion of leading ideas with passing and desultory fancies, which is almost unavoidable in the body of a narrative. M. Rio has, it seems to me, very happily avoided the two extremes of heaviness and flippancy, advocacy and pretended impartiality; and I know no higher commendation in an age in which even able men, after seeking in every possible way to flatter and bias the prejudices and surprise the judgment of their readers, coolly turn round and claim "implicit confidence" on the ground of their own "judicial impartiality" and their total freedom from personal leaning. It is for the reader to judge of the impartiality of an author; and should his mind so far resemble a blank book as to accept all the views and conclusions put before him as so many oracles, still the most dangerous of all authorities to be so far trusted would be one who pretended that the total absence of prejudice was the simplest matter in the world. Mr. Lewes, in his *Physiology of Common Life*, well says that "our philosophy, when not borrowed, is little more than the expression of our personality." You may be attracted by opposite qualities in opposite schools; but your sympathies will almost necessarily lead you to prefer one side or the other. A man might as well claim to feel patriotism for half-a-dozen nations, or ask, like Lord Brougham, to be received as a French citizen without giving up his privileges as an English subject, as profess absolute impartiality. It is true that English common sense revolted from

Lord Brougham's claim to universality when it took this particular shape ; but one is tempted to think that national jealousy had something to do with the feeling, when one remarks how the very men who speak as if moral convictions were fatal to all claims of judgment, are themselves the slaves of interests and prejudices, without even an apparent suspicion that there is any logical inconsistency between their principles and practice. M. Rio makes no such pretensions to virtual infallibility. He owns, however, that, though he by no means prefers bad drawing to good, as many English readers may have been led to expect, yet there are heights of mystical expression which afford him so exquisite a pleasure as to lead him to forgive, and even to forget, the absence of a correct knowledge of anatomy. Of this *mystical ideal*, which is, in his opinion, the chief and peculiar glory of Christian art, he sees a prophetic foreshadowing in the *heroic ideal* of the Greeks, of whom he observes that "it was the privilege to introduce into the world the notion of the ideal;" and that "as the Jewish people seem to have been instituted for the still higher purpose of the worship of truth, so to the Hellenes fell the worship of beauty." To this he adds the noticeable fact, that had it been merely *human* beauty, the most polished and intellectually gifted people of the Greeks would certainly have chosen for their especial patroness and goddess the divinity of love and beauty, whereas they selected the virgin goddess of wisdom. In truth, it was left to Christianity to ennoble love by placing it above wisdom ; a position which no heathen nation, however elevated, could ever have ventured on even imagining, from the inevitable degradation to which such an idea would have been exposed. The goddess of light and fortitude was the fitting head of the heroic ideal of the Greeks, precisely because less subject to deterioration ; and the mystical ideal of love and purity conjoined was left for another race and another religion to carry into another branch of art. But I will let M. Rio speak for himself; and for that purpose choose an extract in which allusion is made to a cardinal difficulty in art, as in science and in politics, from the days of Phidias to the present time:

"We have said that Minerva was the favourite type of the school of Phidias, and we know that he either cast or modelled nine times at least the statue of this goddess, whether for Athens, of which she was the protecting divinity, or for the other cities of Greece. These different statues were far from being simple reproductions of the same type, differing as they did in size, attributes, and character,—here more archaic, there more softened,—for the

style of the artist varied more than once during his long career. One would fancy that he must have proposed to himself the same problem which later schools of painting in their turn tried to solve with more or less of success, namely, how to conciliate, as far as possible, the action of personal and individual genius with respect for types consecrated by immemorial veneration."

According to this view, the ideal may be defined as the expression of general truths in and through particular personages and facts, in other words, the eternal shown forth by the temporary; so that the imagination is stimulated to act for itself in a given direction. Of course this may be more or less lofty, according to the subject, and the method of treating it, the genius of the artist, and the intellect and feelings of the beholder. It is also very evident that technical excellence will generally progress longer than a more spiritual excellence can; nay more, that the very reverence for the noble, or true, or beautiful, or good, which renders an ideal possible, may in some cases interfere with or retard its development. M. Rio gives two most striking examples of this, in the Apollo of Delphi and the Diana of Ephesus, whose types suffered æsthetically from the very respect they inspired. We here see at once the two dangers, in opposite directions, to which all religious ideals are necessarily exposed. On the one hand, a too slavish respect for the conventional; on the other, a diffusive adoration of individual liberty; the first strong and energetic, but somewhat narrow; the other with its energies frittered away in the pursuit of all possible forms of prettiness.

There is another point in this Introduction, less completely developed than the history of the ideal in Greek art and Roman history, though even more intimately connected with the future of Christian art, and, I would add, civilisation, since from the very first it marks a different stamp on the civilisation of the West from that ever exhibited by any purely Eastern nation. I mean, the history of the *spirit of chivalry*. M. Rio well observes, that the heroic spirit in the Greeks led, as it were, to a foretaste of chivalry, in the respect for unsuccessful and unfortunate valour, shown in the histories of the Amazons and Hercules. At the same time it must not be forgotten that, socially, the Greeks approached to the manners and customs of Oriental nations; ignorance and seclusion were the price exacted of all women who would claim respect morally. Yet, in this very people, we see the tutelary divinity of the most polished, intellectual, and powerful of their cities represented not only under the form of a woman, but in the character of a virgin. This

at once shows a tone of thought different from and opposed to that of any purely Eastern nation with which I am acquainted, such as might be expected to result in a widely diverse civilisation from that of the Oriental type. In fact, it is in itself a recognition of the woman as an independent moral being, if not in deed, yet in spirit; for conscience depends upon intellect for its *raison d'être*, and there can be no duty where there is no responsibility. If to this, as yet entirely theoretic, reverence for womanly virginity, we add the other element of nascent chivalry spoken of above, I mean respect for unsuccessful courage, I think we may at once recognise the foundations and rudiments of European civilisation as distinguished from that of the East. Even the Jews possessed only the latter of these two elements of the spirit which gave its peculiar character to the civilisations of Europe; and Samson and the Maccabees are the only characters of Scripture that may be said to be in any *great* degree chivalrous. I remember when a child feeling this sorely in the *Old Testament*, and it has always very clearly explained to me the reaction in favour of the *Old Testament* rather than the *New*, which ensued on the fall of medieval society, connected as this was for so many centuries with the supremacy of the Catholic Church. Greece therefore was, in other respects as well as geographically, a link between Asiatic and European types of civilisation; and, strange to say, ancient Greece appears more Western than modern Greece; partly, doubtless, because Europe has inherited intellectually so much from the Hellenes, but partly also because the Greek schism has thrust the sympathies of the people back towards the Asia their ancestors conquered some 2500 years ago.

Nothing can be more interesting than the pages devoted to Greek art in M. Rio's Introduction, treating as he does of its spirit, and pursuing the course of sculpture from the days of Phidias to those of the Romans, in the masterly manner so necessary to prevent a sketch from degenerating into a mere memorandum of dry facts. The patriotic enthusiasm of the old Romans is no less happily alluded to; and the moral ties by which this half-religious enthusiasm was connected with the Middle Ages, fanciful and ungrounded as many of them were, are very ably touched on. In truth, such analogies are rather important as *signs* of a state of feeling than correct in fact; and the connexion of Virgil with Christianity, so curiously exemplified by Dante's enthusiasm for him, as well as the constant commemoration of the Sibyls in early Italian Christian art, are instances of the tact with

which poetry, art, and popular taste seize on analogies connected with the filiation of ideas, which, when critically examined by scientific men, may appear altogether futile. Each age connects itself with former ages by a double action: on the one hand, by the use of ideas common to both; on the other, by reaction from theories which tend to an empire too absolute for the amount of truth contained in them. And this double tendency corresponds with the perpetual action of progress and degradation ever going on around and within us. In both, it is the relative importance of ideas, personages, and facts, which is apt to be too far insisted on, because an idea is of importance in a particular age by the temporary power it enjoys; and this by no means corresponds with its moral importance, except in an average extended over lengthened periods of years. Therefore, however natural it may be to distort the relative proportions of past events, still ideas do derive their practical importance from the influence which they exercise on history; and it is in chivalrous thoughts and feelings that we trace the principal cause of the peculiarities of European civilisation, as contradistinguished from that of the East, from which it sprang. Now it strikes me that M. Rio does not connect closely enough the chivalric and ascetic ideals. Both seem to me to repose on the same basis, and to have the same thought at their root. If I were obliged to put this thought into two words, they would be "*noblesse oblige*," with the converse and correlative which is necessary to complete its sense and beauty, "*obligation anoblit*." It is the idea of the heroic transplanted into religion, of which chivalry was the lay element as asceticism was the priestly one. The privilege of self-sacrifice is equally at the root of both; only while self-sacrifice for the supernatural good of others is the ascetic ideal, self-sacrifice for the natural good of others is the chivalrous and heroic ideal; while, in both, the mark which distinguishes the true from the false, and the practicable from the utopian, is a certain generous joyousness in the wholesome exercise of qualities adapted to the individual capacities and powers, without which every species of sacrifice is pretty certain to result in either contemptuous self-complacency or grudging self-pity. On the other hand, reverence for weakness, on the part of the hero, is equally necessary, for it is the only means to prevent his aid from becoming an insult or a degradation to his weaker brother; whilst cordial admiration is the best means for preserving the soul of the weaker from the opposite dangers of either wallowing in the pleasures of a security gained by the labour

of others, or an envious depreciation of dangers he had not the courage to share. Whilst this balance endured, chivalry flourished. When nobles and priesthood thought more of their privileges than of their obligations, and traded on the respect earned by those who went before them, then chivalry fell into discredit, and feudalism from power—to be succeeded, after a period of transition, by another state of society, with other virtues and other vices, which will probably perish likewise in its turn, through the same class of causes operating in an opposite quarter.

I have not time or space to follow out, as I could wish, a subject fascinating in proportion to its importance, and difficult to condense, from the many coexistent causes and influences involved in the existence of a state of thought and feeling now past for ever. I will only remark that the large diversity of opinions and action now existing in the world would in itself prevent the possibility of any common standard of sentiment. A hero of the Middle Ages, transplanted into our complex civilisation, would very soon degenerate into a misanthropist or a dupe. When the same moral law is not acknowledged by all, it would be idle to expect men to cultivate the sentiments and graces of Christianity in their intercourse with one another, while they find it as much as they can do to comply with its precepts. Lord Howard of Effingham when commanding the English fleet against the Invincible Armada of Spain, and Sobieski delivering Vienna, though *morally* heroic, were *politically*, to a certain extent, dupes, because they were serving the interests of others rather than their own. Accordingly, we see that modern historians prefer more successful, though more questionable, heroes. It was Dr. Newman who first pointed out the resemblance of the position occupied by Catholics in the present day to that which they held in the later days of the Roman Empire. I would add, that, whereas the English idea of duty tends daily more and more to the old Roman heathen type of the duty of the citizen as paramount to moral considerations, so the French lean rather, generally, to what may be called decomposed Christianity, in which self-sacrifice is preferred to the plainest duties, when it is not even prostituted to the vilest uses.

I have mentioned the only point in which I should be tempted to differ from M. Rio, in the thirty pages where he so eloquently discusses the rise and growth of the ascetic and chivalrous ideals, in which he sees the animating spirit of modern Christian art; I cannot resist translating the

beautiful passage with which he opens this the concluding part of the Introduction.

"During this sleep of the arts, the ascetic and chivalrous ideals, pursued with an ardour and success until then unexampled, raised souls and characters to a height unknown to pagan antiquity. These two forms of the ideal differed in their origin, as well as in their means and in their object. The cradle of the ascetic ideal was in the deserts of the Thebaid, or rather it remounted, at least in germ, to the very source of Christianity; whilst the chivalrous ideal, half Teutonic and half Christian, belonged exclusively to Western Europe, and had only begun to show itself after the invasion of the barbarians. It was not even contained in germ in the Catacombs, which were the refuges of Christians almost too resigned, who, following to the letter the example of the Immaculate Lamb, prayed for their executioners, before offering themselves to the slaughter; whereas those who, later, called themselves the soldiers of Christ, were, more or less, the redressers of wrongs, of which, in their eyes, the most unpardonable was any outrage offered to the objects of their worship (*culte*), whether visible or invisible, in heaven or on earth. From this feeling flowed an order of ideas and sentiments which, after having long disconcerted the pedantry of legislators, ended by systematising itself, and became, in combination with Christian institutions, the soul of a new society, in which there flourished simultaneously, and side by side, the ascetic ideal, answering to the city of God, and the chivalrous ideal, answering to the city of the world. It was but natural that the first, which grew immediately out of the evangelical counsels, should precede the latter by some centuries."

M. Rio's English readers will be interested by his remarks on the two poetical centres round which the romances of the Middle Ages grouped themselves, those, namely, of Charlemagne and the Round Table. He selects the romance of Roland as the typical one of the first, and that of Pierreforest or Percival of the second; admirers of the Laureate will be disappointed at the omission of the name of Sir Galahad. There is surely something remarkable in the attention which has been reawakened in the same direction by men so distinguished and so diverse as Mr. Tennyson, M. Rio, M. de Montalembert, M. de Villemarqué, and Mr. Vitet (whose translation of Theroald's romance of *Roland* is the best, as might be expected), and I will add M. Victor Hugo, Mr. Russell Lowell, and Friedrich Halm. It indicates, if I mistake not, a reaction against the dangers to be apprehended from an exclusive worship of material advantages, began, as might be supposed, by those who feel most acutely that "man cannot live by bread alone," though they differ widely as to the nature of the necessary remedy, and the

direction in which it is to be sought. The most opposite causes combine sometimes to produce the same results; and the enthusiasm for Dante, which has revived so vividly during the last thirty years, and which has been used for the most opposite purposes and in the most opposite interests, has had much to do, perhaps, with the production of an awakened interest in those mediæval centuries of which, in both the faults and the virtues of his character, he was the type, and which he illustrated by his surpassing genius. It is with the name of the great poet, the friend and inspirer of Giotto, that M. Rio fitly concludes his Introduction, and inaugurates his history of Christian art.

The Siennese school, but slightly alluded to in the old edition, occupies two most interesting chapters in this. The researches of the Milanesi have enabled M. Rio to thread his way through a history complicated in no ordinary degree, whilst he preserves the dramatic interest of his narrative. And, while I am on this subject, let me observe that the accuracy and analytic talent of such German art-critics as Rumohr and Gaye has had the most happy influence on the later artistic archæologists of Italy. It has made them alive to the necessity of a rigid examination of the comparative merits of authorities, and to the evils of second-hand copying, inaccurate research, and hasty generalising. Le Monnier's edition of Vasari would not have been possible had there not been in most Italian towns men with a well-grounded and accurate knowledge of the art of their own cities and districts; and it is only by division of labour that such results can be obtained. Our own times are peculiarly favourable to enterprises of this kind; and they afford an indispensable help to writers who occupy so large a field as M. Rio, who has thus been enabled to combine accuracy of detail with picturesque effect and power of generalisation. The "early Florentine school" is succeeded, in his volumes, by the Renaissance and the Medici, and this again by "the Popes and the Renaissance." This sort of arrangement, thoroughly appropriate to the aim of the work, and necessary to its dramatic interest, involves, perhaps, the necessity of a more elaborate table of contents than he has given us, if not also, as I should be disposed to wish, an identical heading to the chapters. There are also inaccuracies of date, which have evidently been left by mistake, at pp. 341 and 345, respecting the birth and death of Masolino and Masaccio. It is true, they are corrected in the note at p. 348; but the wrong date of the birth of Masolino, at p. 345, might tend to throw discredit on one of

the most valuable suggestions in the book—I mean the surmise of Masaccio's having been a pupil of Gentile da Fabriano, and of his making *two* journeys to Rome, instead of the one mentioned by Vasari. This is connected with the discovery, or rather identification, now first mentioned (p. 13 of vol. ii.), of one of the most interesting pictures in the history of art, *i.e.* the legend of the erection of S. M. Maggiore, painted by Masaccio for one of the chapels of that basilica, praised by Michael Angelo, and commemorated by Vasari. M. Rio thinks he has identified this picture with one in the Museum of Naples, which has been attributed in turn to Giotto and Fra Angelico. The exact agreement of the picture with Vasari's account, the peculiarity of the subject, and, above all, the two portraits contained in it of Martin V. and the Emperor Sigismund in the characters of Pope Liberius and Constantius, must make this easily ascertainable; and the names of the two masters to whom it was attributed in the Neapolitan catalogues would go far to prove the correctness of M. Rio's surmise, which, by conciliating the varying versions of the best authorities, would render the career of Masaccio as clear and free from contradictions as the history of art requires that it should become. Moreover, the fact of Masaccio's having painted so much during a life of twenty-eight years, and making two journeys to Rome, would tend to account for the smaller part which M. Rio, following Le Monnier's edition of Vasari, ascribes to him in the frescoes of the Brancacci Chapel at Florence. At the same time, I must own to not agreeing in the unqualified preference shown by our author for the frescoes of San Clemente over those of Florence.

Especially interesting are the details, scattered through M. Rio's three volumes, of that school of Christian sculpture which illustrated Tuscany during the thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries, of which Niccolò Pisano was the patriarch, and which from the centre cities of Sienna, Pisa, Pistoja, Lucca, and Florence, spread itself through the greater part of Central and Northern Italy from Milan to Subiaco. There exist materials in many towns on the roads between Florence and Rome, which, put together and collated, ought to throw much light upon the history of this school of combined sculpture and architecture, mosaic and metal work; and I remember, many years ago, M. Rio pointing out a Roman branch of these combined arts, which was probably founded by Arnolfo del Cambio, one of Niccolò's most celebrated pupils. There are many most valuable remarks and materials respecting the Pisani and

Arnolfo in Le Monnier's edition ; but the contemptuous errors of Vasari's text make it a positive disadvantage to the notes to be so accompanied. The earlier disciples of this school almost invariably signed their works ; and the long inscriptions they frequently added would enable this chapter of art to be satisfactorily rewritten. Niccolo himself appears to have been born in Sienna, though of a Pisan family ; and the school of sculpture founded by him, and derived from his study of ancient bas-reliefs, retained sufficient life, as well as traces enough of its classical origin, to ally itself with Italian Gothic, with its mixture of Byzantine-Romanesque and northern features ; and then by a gradual change, of which Giacopo della Quercia was the initiator, it combined itself equally, harmoniously, through almost insensible gradations, with the classic revival in architecture of Alberti and Brunelleschi. Much might be said on this most captivating school of Christian sculpture, in its two mystical and heroic aspects : that is to say, on the one hand, the Della Robbias, Matteo Civitale of Lucca, the two Majani, Desiderio da Settignano, Antonio Rossellino, and Mino da Fiesole ; on the other, Donatello, and, uniting the two, Lorenzo Ghiberti, Benedetto Rovezzano, and, finally, Michael Angelo. The English public, first familiarised with its beauties through the copies of the Crystal Palace, can now, I believe, study them at Kensington, in the purchases from the Campana collection ; and this is the more fortunate, as one of the few yawning gaps in the Manchester Art-Exhibition was in this direction ; to which I will add the mystical Venetian school of painting, of which I do not *know* one first-rate specimen in England.

I need not say that the Umbrian and Mystical schools, with the chapters on Savonarola and his disciples, are treated *con amore* by M. Rio. He was, indeed, one of the first who defended this school, and especially Pinturricchio, from the unjust depreciation of Vasari, and pointed out the importance of Urbino as a centre of art, both pictorial and architectural. His third volume contains Leonardo and his school, together with those of Bergamo, Cremona, Lodi, and Ferrara. That of Lodi will be especially new to most English readers ; and in fact M. Rio was the first who drew much attention to it. Lorenzo Lotto, Moretto, Boccaccino, and the Piazzas, are badly represented in England, so far as I am aware ; and of Luini, perhaps the best specimen is the St. Catherine, belonging to Mr. Howard of Corby. An interesting identification of a very rare master is mentioned, p. 434 of M. Rio's third volume,—I think, for the first time.

It is a picture in the Corsini Gallery, in Rome, by Ercole Grandi of Ferrara. Perhaps in the reaction from the previous preposterous overrating of the houses of Medici and Este, M. Rio has been thrown somewhat into the opposite extreme.

It has long been the fashion to confound mysticism with dryness, and the reasons for this are obvious; but it is sufficient to remind those who would make it a *rule*, that Paolo Uccelli and Fra Angelico were almost exact contemporaries, as were also Vittore Pisanelli, Benozzo Gozzoli, and Gentile da Fabriano. Benozzo Gozzoli, Bellini, and Francia are, perhaps, the three artists who most consistently combine design and colour with the ascendancy of the mystic element, and they are almost equalled in this respect by Perugino and Pinturricchio, whilst in others they are surpassed by Fra Bartolomeo, who is scarcely to be appreciated out of Italy. Some of Raffael's, Andrea del Sarto's, and Titian's sacred pictures possess the same charm; and I would instance the "*Noli me tangere*" of the last, in the National Gallery, as perhaps superior to the Manfrini's Deposition from the Cross, of which a duplicate is in the Louvre.

A fourth volume, which may soon be expected to appear, will complete M. Rio's elaborate work; and at present I must take leave of him with a quotation from his beautiful chapter on *La Renaissance* and *La Papauté*, which will do more than any words of mine to recommend his book to my readers.

"The voice of the Popes, powerless to combine Christendom in arms against the Turks, was not less so in containing the intellectual movement of the age within just limits. At the accession of Paul II., it became necessary to institute a mysterious law-suit against some of the members of the Roman Academy, surprised, it was said, in flagrant apostasy; and a line of demarcation, often arbitrary, had to be traced between the domain of legitimate science and that of innovations which might compromise faith. It was an additional complication for the Papacy to surmount, in its threefold duties towards its Divine Founder, towards its subjects, and towards itself. The bark of St. Peter, beaten by the diversified tempests of the Middle Ages, was compelled now to steer amid new breakers, with pilots who did not altogether escape the weaknesses of their times, but who were guided fortunately always by the same compass.

The relation in which the Sovereign Pontiffs stood to the productions of contemporaneous literature became then more and more delicate, and the same was the case with regard to the imaginative arts, and especially with regard to painting, more particularly

exposed to the growing invasions of naturalism and paganism. There existed in this direction a twofold temptation, which became every day more seducing, and against which it was all the more difficult to guard, from the impossibility of denying to it a certain amount of legitimate influence. There could thus be no question of absolute exclusion, but rather a question of equilibrium and just moderation, which it was necessary to solve; and this the Papacy did with a sureness of tact, and a width of view, which it would be impossible to over-estimate. If the Holy See had only favoured in art the traditional and ascetic side, it would have been surpassed by the more clear-sighted and worldly patronage of the secular power; and if it had immoderately favoured the scientific and naturalistic element, it would have been unfaithful to its mission. See, then, with what a marvellous instinct it appropriated, and assimilated to itself, all the advances and discoveries which succeeded one another so rapidly during the fifteenth century. When Gentile da Fabriano, the painter of naïves and holy inspirations, is called to Rome to decorate the Basilica of the Lateran, Masaccio and Victor Pisanello are assigned to him as his fellow-workers,—the two artists, that is to say, who were most eminent in an opposite direction; and when Nicholas V. sends for Fra Angelico of Fiesole, he sends also at the same time for Leo Battista Alberti and Piero della Francesca. The same equilibrium is maintained under Sixtus IV., who makes Perugino work side by side with Luca Signorelli in the Sixtine Chapel, and under Innocent VIII., who employs the graceful hand of Pinturicchio and the profound art of Mantegna in the joint decoration of the Vatican. And lastly, during the pontificate of Julius II. both tendencies find their highest and most perfect expression, in the simultaneous works of Raffael and Michael Angelo."

F. H.

EDMUND CAMPION.—No. VI.

WHEN our pilgrims came to Rheims, they were received with the greatest joy by all those confessors and servants of God that lived there. Campion was specially welcomed by Allen and the rest, for old acquaintanc' sake: they had not seen him for eight years or more, so there was no end to their embracing and welcoming the good man; and besides, he and his companions were already looked upon as martyrs. Even from a distance, at Rome, it had seemed no easy thing to get into England without discovery; but fresh difficulties had grown up daily, and at Rheims the missionaries were told of a new proclamation, in which Elizabeth declared that she had notice of the Pope, the King of Spain, the Duke of Flo-

rence, and other Catholic princes having made a league against her to invade her realm, at the persuasion of some of her subjects who lived beyond sea. This was easily seen to be a plain preface and introduction to the rigour of persecution which awaited all priests who should convey themselves into the country. Here also they heard of the unfortunate expedition into Ireland, to which, as we have seen, may be attributed much of the severity with which they were treated.

Campion, therefore, feeling that the case was somewhat altered, and that there was now less chance of success in the undertaking, went to Allen, and said, "Well, sir, here now I am; you have desired my going to England, and I am come a long journey, as you see,—from Prague to Rome, and from Rome hither. Do you think that my labours in England will countervail all this travail, as well as my absence from Bohemia, where, though I did not much, yet I was not idle nor unemployed, and that also against heretics?" The president answered, "My good father, your labours in Beme-land, though I do not doubt but they were very profitable, yet do I imagine that another man of your Society may supply the same, or at least two or three. But towards England I verily hope that Almighty God will give you strength and grace to supply for many men; and seeing that your obligation is greater towards your own country than towards any other, and the necessity of help more urgent, and the talents that God hath given you more fit and proper for that than for any other land, doubt you not but that all is Christ's holy providence for the best; and so be you of good comfort." "As for me," said Campion, "all is one; and I hope I am and shall be ever indifferent for all nations and functions whereinsoever my superiors under God shall employ me. I have made a free oblation of myself to His Divine Majesty, both for life and death, and that I hope He will give me grace and force to perform; and this is all I desire."

Campion was glad of an opportunity to preach to the students, for he had not spoken publicly in English for many years. He preached on the text, *Ignem veni mittere in terram*, and Parsons remembered one principal point which he handled,—“to compare the new religion of England to a fire, which, being once kindled in any one house of a city, obliges all men, as well friends as enemies of the owner, to run to quench it. And to show the truth of this comparison, he repeated briefly the hurts that this fire had already done in our country: how many goodly churches, monasteries, and other monuments of piety it had devoured in an instant,

which our Catholic forefathers had set up in so many hundred years ; how many holy orders of religious of both sexes it had dissolved ; how many hearts of weak people it had inflamed to marry or live in incest, that had before served God either in virginity or chastity ; what devilish division and heat of hatred it had enkindled in the hearts of Englishmen, even amongst those that by nature should be most loving : and having thus showed the fury of the fire, he exhorted his fellow-priests and all the company present to put their helping hands and endeavours to the staying or quenching of the same. And if the water of Catholic doctrine would not serve, nor milk of sweet and holy conversation, they should cast blood also of potent martyrdom, which, it might be hoped, would be accepted for the quenching thereof." While he was describing the outbreak of the conflagration, Bombinus tells us that he cried out "fire, fire, fire," so loud, that the passers-by were going to fetch the water-buckets to put it out.* Allen, who heard him, wrote to Rome a few days afterwards,—“Whether he was inspired by his subject, or whether it was a miracle of memory, he spoke English as fluently and as correctly as if he had but yesterday come fresh out of England.”

Before the missionaries departed for England, the places of Bishop Goldwell and Dr. Morton, who were obliged to stay behind, were filled up by two priests of Rheims, Dr. Ely and Mr. John Hart. They were also joined by Father Thomas Cottam, an English Jesuit, who had been long labouring in Poland, and who was only ordered to go to his native country for the recovery of his health. They wisely determined not to risk their whole adventure in one boat, but to divide themselves into small parties, and to reach England by different roads. Dr. Bromburg and Mr. Bruscoe went by Dieppe ; Sherwin led his pupil Pascal round by Rouen, where he found young Edward Throckmorton, by whom he wrote an affectionate letter to his old master at Rome, begging Father Alphonsus to accept Throckmorton in his place. It was a fair exchange. Sherwin died a martyr with Campion in England ; Throckmorton died after a few years in the odour of sanctity at the English college in Rome. Giblet, Crane, and Kemp went by Abbeville and Boulogne ; Dr. Ely, Riston, Kirby, Hart, and Cottam went by Douai and Dunkirk ; lastly, Campion, Parsons, and Ralph Emerson went, on the 6th of June, to St. Omer, where there was a fair college of the order.

* I suspect that Bombinus only worked an old joke into his narrative ; it is not likely that the passengers in the streets of Rheims would have understood the word “fire” at all.

They had to travel through "a country filled with soldiers of divers sorts and conditions, but all perilous to one who should fall into their hands; but their lot was cast, and they depended on the Master and Commander of all, who led them through without hurt, stay, or trouble." When they reached the residence at St. Omer, the Flemish fathers thought their safe coming thither to be miraculous, and tried to dissuade them from carrying out their undertaking any further. It would be tempting Providence to dare such an accumulation of new dangers. The Queen and Council, they were told, had been informed divers ways of their coming, and were much exasperated. Several spies, who knew all their names, who had lived with them in Rome, and could describe their persons and habit, had given particular information to the Council, who in turn had given it to the searchers and officers of all the ports; so that it was impossible to enter without being taken. Nay, their very pictures had been taken and sent to the officers, to help in identifying them.

These rumours had been spread by the English Catholic exiles who lived at St. Omer. Among these was one wiser than the rest, Mr. George Chamberlain, a gentleman of a very worshipful house, in banishment for his conscience, who had married a Flemish lady. As a discreet and well-qualified person, he was consulted on the matter, and said that such reports had certainly come from England, and were like enough to be true in general, though he did not believe all the particulars. He did not think that the Council could have found out so much in so little time; yet it would be wise to deliberate well before setting out on such a journey. Parsons and Campion replied that the journey itself was long ago deliberated and determined, and offered to God; so there could be no new deliberation on it, but only about the manner, way, place, and time of effecting it. On this they asked Chamberlain's advice, and begged him to declare it in the presence of the fathers of St. Omer, and to hear the reasons on the other side, so that the journey might be prosecuted with the good liking and approbation of all, without waiting for a new crop of difficulties and perils.

So Chamberlain went with them to the College, where Parsons and Campion expounded their commission and desires, and the reasons for their haste: they said that the dangers, granting them to be as great as was reported, would only grow greater daily; that it did not matter if the Council knew their names, for they had license to change them and their apparel, which they would take care to make very different from the habits in which the spies had seen them;

that many men were like each other, and the informers could scarcely have so exact a knowledge of their persons as to identify them under all disguises; that the story about the pictures was impossible,—the spies had not procured them in Rome, had scarcely been able to find limners in England to paint them from description, and had not had time to make so many copies. So the Flemish fathers were asked to commend the matter to God, and let the missionaries go forward; for this, they were persuaded, was God's will, and the meaning of their superiors in Rome.

Parsons' object,—which was, I suppose, to secure the acquiescence of Chamberlain as a representative of the English laity, and of the Flemish fathers on the part of the Society, and thus to provide by anticipation an answer to probable charges of rashness and want of consideration for the interests of others,—was attained when Chamberlain and the fathers professed themselves contented with his reasons, and proceeded to advise with him on the manner of their going. The result of their consultation was, that Parsons was to go by himself through Calais to Dover, and if he succeeded was to send for Campion. Parsons was to pass for a soldier returning from the Low Countries, Campion for a merchant of jewels; and Parsons reflects on the appropriateness of the disguise, as their mission was really a warfare, and their business the merchandise of the "pearl of great price," and the traffic in the talents which their Lord had lent them. Parsons departed the next day, having been furnished by Chamberlain with a captain's uniform of buff trimmed with gold-lace, with hat and feather to match, and another suit for a person who went with him as his man George. He went to Calais on St. Barnabas' Day, June 11, and found a ready passage to Dover, where he arrived the next morning. There the searcher examined him, and so far from misdoubting him let him pass with all favour, and procured him a horse to carry him to Gravesend. Parsons took heart at this providential courtesy of the searcher, by whom he had been treated with exceptional politeness, and told him that a friend of his, Mr. Edmunds, a merchant lying at St. Omer, would follow him shortly, to whom he begged that like favour might be shown. The searcher even undertook to forward to Edmunds—under which name my readers of course recognise Campion—a letter, in which Parsons told him that he had thought of certain special and urgent causes why he should make haste to London for utterance of jewels and the like,—a letter which might be shown to the searcher when he came over.

Parsons reached Gravesend at midnight, and at once got into a tilt-boat proceeding to London. He was horrified at finding himself in the midst of a quantity of gentlemen of the Inns of Court and of the Queen's household, who had been merry-making in Kent, and who kept playing and singing half through the night. Parsons, in dread of being recognised in the daylight, took the opportunity before the gentlemen were awake of jumping into a wherry, which landed him and his man in Southwark about four o'clock in the morning. But here he was in fresh difficulties; he had no horse, and so was not acceptable to the hosts of the inns, who were moreover made extraordinarily cautious by the late proclamations and rumours against suspicious people; besides, they saw that his dress was outlandish, and one and all refused to harbour him.

After spending most of the morning in his bootless search over Southwark for a lodging, he resolved to apply to some Catholic. He knew not where any lived, but was sure to find plenty of them at any of the prisons. So he went to the Marshalsea, and inquired for one Thomas Pounce, Esquire, who had lain there and in other prisons many years for his faith. Pounce took Parsons into his room, was delighted at his safe arrival, and told him that he and the other Catholic prisoners had been praying earnestly for many days for him and Campion, and that they must now return thanks. Parsons replied that they must continue their prayers some days longer, for Campion was not yet come over. Parsons then dined with the numerous Catholic prisoners, and afterwards committed himself to the guidance of one of the guests, Mr. Edward Brooksby, who led him to a Catholic house in the City, a kind of club, where he found other gentlemen and priests, and notably Mr. George Gilbert, a young gentleman of large property in Suffolk and other counties, who had succeeded young to his wealth. He had been brought up in London in the current religion; but his earnest nature inclined him rather to Puritanism, in which he had been confirmed by daily frequenting the sermons of Deering, the famous preacher. But after he came to the enjoyment of his property, he obtained leave to travel; and in Paris providentially fell into the company of Father Robert Darbyshire, the Jesuit, who opened his eyes to the Catholic religion. Father Parsons, in Rome, completed his conversion, and stood his godfather at his confirmation. From that time, though the new convert still pursued his studies, and learned the accomplishments for which Italy was then famous,—riding, fencing, vaulting, and the like, for he was of stal-

wart growth,—yet he secretly added all kinds of religious exercises, such as prayer, fasting, mortification, and liberal almsgiving.

Gilbert wished to expend his first fervour in a pilgrimage to Jerusalem ; but Parsons persuaded him rather to return to England, and lay out his money on priests and on other means of advancing the Catholic cause. The result was, that he drew together and organised divers principal young men for this purpose, who took lodging together and sojourned in the chief pursuivant's house in Fetter or Chancery Lane. The pursuivant had great credit with the Bishop of London, Aylmer; they had also another powerful protector at Fulham, where was the focus of their peril, in the person of the Bishop's son-in-law, Dr. Adam Squire, who was in their pay. Through the connivance of these men they were able to receive priests, and to have Masses celebrated daily in their house for some years, till the Jesuits came in, when the times grew much more exasperated.

Gilbert's friends had induced him to make advances to a young heiress, and he was about to be married when he heard of the mission of Parsons and Campion to England ; on this he broke it off, and resolved never to marry, and would needs have made a vow—with Parsons' approbation—as soon as he came to him in England. But Parsons would not at first permit it, though at last he allowed him to vow chastity till the Catholic religion should be publicly professed in England.

After being introduced to this club, Parsons gave directions about Campion, who was shortly to follow him, and set out, under the guidance of Mr. Henry Orton, to visit certain gentlemen in the counties round London. After three weeks he hoped to return, and to find that his companion had arrived.

While this was going on in England, Campion was left in doubt and anxiety at St. Omer, from whence, on the 20th of June, he wrote the following letter to Everardus Mercurianus, the general.

“ Father Robert, with Brother George his companion, had sailed from Calais after midnight, on the day before I began writing this; the wind was very good, so we hope that he reached Dover some time yesterday morning, the sixteenth of June. He was dressed up like a soldier,—such a peacock, such a swaggerer, that a man needs must have very sharp eyes to catch a glimpse of any holiness and modesty shrouded beneath such a garb, such a look, such a strut. Yet our minds cannot but misgive us when we hear all men, I will not say whispering, but crying, the news of our coming. It is a venture

which only the wisdom of God can bring to good, and to His wisdom we lovingly resign ourselves. According to orders, I have stayed behind for a time, to try, if possible, to fish some news about Father Roberts' success out of the carriers, or out of certain merchants who are to come to these parts, before I sail across. If I hear any thing, I will advise upon it; but in any case I will go over and take part in the fight, though I die for it. It often happens that the first rank of a conquering army is knocked over. Indeed, if our Society is to go on with this adventure, the ignorance and wickedness against which this war is declared will have to be overthrown. On the twentieth of June I mean to go to Calais: in the mean time I live in the College at St. Omer, where I am dressing up myself and my companion Ralph. You may imagine the expense, especially as none of our old things can be henceforth used. As we want to disguise our persons, and to cheat the madness of this world, we are obliged to buy several little things which seem to us altogether absurd. Our journey, these clothes, and four horses, which we must buy as soon as we reach England, may possibly square with our money; but only with the help of the Providence which multiplied the loaves in the wilderness. This, indeed, is our least difficulty, so let us have done with it. I will not yet close this letter, that I may add whatever news reaches me during these three days. For though our lot will be cast one way or other before you read this, yet I thought I ought, while I am here, to trace every particular of this great business, and the last doings, on which the rest, as yet unwritten, will hang. There is a certain English gentleman, very knowing in matters of state, who comes often to me; he tells me that the coming of the Bishop of St. Asaph is canvassed in letters and in conversation. Great expectations are raised by it; for most men think that such a man, at his age, would never undertake such a task, except there was some rising on foot. I told him in the simplest manner the true cause of his coming. Still he did not cease wondering; for the episcopal name and function is in high honour in England.

To day the wind is falling, so I will make haste to the sea. I have been thoroughly well treated in St. Omer College, and helped with all things needful. Indeed, in our whole journey we received incredible comfort in all the residences of our fathers. We also enjoyed the hospitality of two most illustrious Cardinals, Paleotto and Borromeo, and of the Archpriest Collensi. We purposely avoided Paris and Douai. I think we are safe, unless we are betrayed in these sea-side places. I have stayed a day longer than I meant, and as I hear nothing good or bad of Father Robert, I persuade myself that he has got through safely. I pray God ever to protect your reverence, and your assistants, and the whole Society. Farewell."

Campion must have received Parsons' communication immediately after closing this letter to his general; he at once, with full confidence of success, prepared to follow. He

was very glad that the feast of his old patron, St. John the Baptist, was so near at hand—indeed, it fell out that he crossed over on the very day; for he was obliged to wait four days at Calais for a good wind, and at last he put to sea on the evening of the 24th of June, and reached Dover before daylight. He landed on the sands, and retired behind a great rock, to fall on his knees and commend his cause and his whole coming to God, whether it might be for life or for death. Then he and Brother Ralph went to look for the searcher, whom they hoped to find in as good a humour as Parsons had left him; but times were changed, for stricter orders had come down from the Council to look more diligently to his charge, with a reprimand to him and the mayor for having, as was supposed, allowed certain priests to pass that way into the realm.

Besides this, some spy had advertised the Council out of France that Mr. Gabriel Allen, brother to the president, was about to visit his friends in Lancashire; and a description of Allen's person had been furnished, agreeing in the main with the stature, physiognomy, and person of Campion. Hereupon he and Ralph were seized and carried before the Mayor of Dover: he charged them with being foes of the queen's religion, and friends of the old faith; with sailing under false names; with having been abroad for religion; and with returning for the purpose of propagating popery. Campion, he declared, was Allen; but this Campion offered to swear was not the case. At last he resolved to send them up, under guard, to the Council, and ordered the horses to be prepared. Campion all the while was standing, praying in his heart to God, and begging the intercession of his patron, St. John the Baptist; then an old man came forth from the chamber whither the mayor had retired: "You are dismissed," he said; "good-bye."

He and Ralph thereupon made all the haste they could to London, where he was anxiously expected, and where much prayer was being made for his safety; for the great fear was, what he would do when he first arrived. But it happened that when the boat in which he was a passenger came to the Hythe at London, Thomas Jay, one of the Catholic Club, was watching for him: he had never seen him; but partly through Parsons' description of his person and apparel, partly through seeing him in company with the little brother Ralph, who had also been described to him, he suspected him to be the man, and so boldly stepped to the boat's side: "Mr. Edmunds, give me your hand; I stay here for you, to lead you to your friends." And he led him,

nothing loth, to the house in Chancery Lane, where Gilbert and the rest clothed and armed him like a gentleman, and furnished him with a horse. This was on the morning of June 26th.

Parsons, who was still in the country, had left word that Campion should stay in London for his return, and employ his time in the best manner he could for the comfort of Catholics. Hereupon the young men entreated him to preach to them on the 29th of June, the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul. There was great difficulty in fixing upon a place, for their house would not hold all that wished to attend, and no public place was safe; so at last they chose the great hall of a house near Smithfield, which Lord Paget hired for them of Lord Norreys, where the servants and porters were for the nonce replaced by gentlemen of worship and honour; and while these trusty watchmen guarded the ways, Campion preached on the Gospel, taking for his text both St. Peter's confession, *Tu es Christus, Filius Dei vivi*; and our Lord's answer, *Et ego dico tibi quia tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram edificabo Ecclesiam meam*. From the former he animated them to the true confession of Christ in that faith and religion of His which first He sent to our nation when it was converted from Paganism; from the latter, he laid before them the indignity, danger, and folly of insulting against this invincible rock of Peter and his successors; and the effect of his whole sermon was to draw forth many tears in consideration of the one, and to plant in all that heard him great courage and fortitude for the execution of the other.

His sermon so strongly affected those who heard him, that each of them supposed that if this loose Catholic or that sincere Protestant could be brought to speak with the preacher, the conversion of the wanderer would be secured; hence Campion's coming was entrusted as a grand secret to half the world, and after a few days, which he well spent in conferences with all comers, the Council began to suspect what was on hand, and set on foot a diligent search for his apprehension. They at first tried the stratagem of sending false brothers to hear him, and to apprehend him at Mass or preaching; there were spies abroad, sighing for Catholic sermons, and showing great devotion and desire of them, especially if any of the Jesuits might be heard. But Campion was advertised of this scheme by some principal persons of the court, and therefore took greater heed with whom he conversed, employing himself only in private conferences and exhortations in secret friends' houses during eight or ten days, till Parsons returned to deliberate with him what

course to follow for prosecuting their affairs within the realm.

But even these quiet proceedings were known to the queen and Council, who only abstained from violent measures in the hopes of being able to capture at one stroke not only the Jesuits, but a considerable number of the chief Catholics, at some of the conferences. The Government was exceedingly stung to hear of so many priests having entered the realm at once; for besides the twelve who came from Rome, several had been sent from France and Flanders, not, as Parsons protests, in consequence of any previous agreement, "but by chance, or rather God's providence, divers of them not knowing the one of the other's journey."

But though the Council kept silence for the present, the searchers of London grew so eager and frequent, and the spies so many and diligent, that scarce an hour passed without some Catholic being reported as taken up on suspicion, or detected. As a specimen of the dangers which the two Jesuits were continually incurring, take this story. Henry Orton, the young gentleman who had been Parsons' conductor in his short expedition into the country, set out one morning from his lodging in Smithfield to visit Campion and Parsons. On the way, there stood Sledd, a man who had been in the English College at Rome, but had turned spy and informer, with a constable, ready to apprehend any one he might recognise. He had known Orton in Rome; and though he knew the young man was neither priest nor Jesuit, yet he guessed that he conversed with such as were; so he followed him a while in the street; and if he had followed him a little farther, he would have found the very house where the two fathers were together, and would have captured them both at once. But Sledd had not patience, and caused Orton to be apprehended in the street, whereby the fathers were warned, and so provided for themselves.

Again, there was then in London a very grave and godly priest, Mr. Robert Johnson, who had visited Rome as a pilgrim shortly before the departure of the fathers for England. He had already laboured painfully in his own country for some years, and before he returned to his work he had retired, on Parsons' recommendation, into a house of Jesuits, where he had gone through the spiritual exercises of St. Ignatius. On his way to England he was joined by Sledd the spy, who was then talking like a most enthusiastic Papist, but behaving so loosely that Johnson was obliged to reprehend him; at which Sledd was so angry that he at first meditated murdering him on the spot,

but on after consideration determined to betray him to the English Government instead. He therefore went to the English ambassador at Paris, and gave all needful advertisements about Johnson and other priests both to him and to Jerome Vane, a spy attached to the embassy. One day, when Sledd was loitering about London on his treacherous mission, he saw Johnson going through Smithfield in company with Catherine, sister of Sir John Petre, and wife of John Talbot of Grafton. He followed him till he saw a constable, whom he charged in the queen's name to arrest Johnson as a priest and traitor. The constable, at heart a Catholic, made all sorts of excuses; but on Sledd's threatening to report him to the recorder, he took up his staff, and told Sledd to show him the man who was to be arrested. Sledd did so, and was about to depart, when the constable told him he must follow to give the man in charge, and to bear the possible consequences of a false arrest and imprisonment. The true motive, however, was to expose Sledd as an informer to the mocks and jibes of the people, and to make his trade known to the world. So Sledd and the constable dogged Johnson's steps till he came to the Thames, and saw him hire a wherry to convey him over to Southwark, where Parsons and Campion were in council, with several other priests. Sledd told the constable to take another boat and row after Johnson; but the constable, guessing something of the errand on which the priest was bound, told his companion that he could not spend all the day dodging a man in a boat, perhaps to miss him at last; so he cried out to the bystanders to stop the traitor, and arrested him then and there. And though Johnson was taken, and thrust into a prison, from which he only emerged to pass through Westminster Hall to the scaffold, yet the lesson was not lost. Sledd was at once noted, and expelled from Catholic society before he had time to do much more mischief. A report of the capture soon reached the assembled priests, who broke up in disorder.

Amid such escapes it became clear to the friends of the fathers that London was no place for them; they were therefore counselled to shorten their stay there, and to despatch with speed such things as were to be considered or determined before their departure. They therefore collected in a little house in Southwark the gravest priests then to be found in London, among whom were Edward Mettam and Blackwell, afterwards the archpriest, and also "divers principal laymen, for their better satisfaction; for that sundry points of importance were to be discussed." *Quod omnes tangit, ab omnibus tractari et approbari debet*; and it was but na-

tural that in matters of common concern the clergy and laity should take common counsel at a time of danger, when the active coöperation of both classes was necessary in order to secure the interests of either. So far as the faith was concerned, there were no questions to discuss among the English Catholics in 1580. But questions of morals, worship, discipline, and political conduct, in which all were equally interested, urgently claimed at that moment the consideration and the agreement of all.

The first question to be discussed was the answer to be made, for the satisfaction both of Protestants and Catholics, to the rumour raised on occasion of the entrance of the Jesuits into the realm; it was said to be for treason, conspiracy, and matter of state, and not for religion. Sanders, in his book on the ecclesiastical monarchy, excuses the English Catholics for failing to support the rebellion of the great earls of the north, on the ground that they did not know of the Bull; and the English statesmen retorted that this want of information was diligently and cunningly supplied by sending the Jesuits and seminary priests into the realm. They said also that while a Bull was in existence, declaring that Elizabeth had no right or title to the crown, all who submitted, or were prepared to submit, to the authority which proclaimed it, were in their hearts secret traitors, and only waiting the occasion to declare themselves open traitors; which occasion it was necessary to remove, by preventing the secret promulgation of the Bull by the agency of the missionary priests. Moreover, it would be argued that the famous mitigation obtained by Campion and Parsons did not in the least affect the substance of the Bull, whereby the queen still remained excommunicate and deposed, but merely allowed the English Catholics to exhibit to her a temporary and conditional fealty and obedience (*rebus sic stantibus*) as long as they could not help themselves:—but the moment they could, or thought they could, or were told by the Pope that the time was come, then their obedience and fealty were to end; the censures were to resume their full force, and the queen was to be violently assailed. The mitigation would thus be made to appear like a truce obtained upon false pretences by one belligerent party, only in order to gain time to recruit his forces for a new attack. Moreover, it would be called absurd in the Roman missionaries to expect that their master's agents would be allowed all the privileges of a friendly power in England, while he and his agents in Ireland were carrying on an open war against the queen of both realms. It was to be feared that by these considerations “all their spiri-

tual and ecclesiastical functions might be brought into obloquy and hatred with the people, and much cruelty inflicted both on the said clergymen themselves when they should be taken, and on all other Catholics for their sake."

But to all this the fathers said they had but one answer to give: their public and private denial of any such intentions as were imputed to them. They therefore there and then made oaths before God, and the priests and laymen assembled, that their coming was only apostolical, to treat matters of religion in truth and simplicity, and to attend to the gaining of souls, without any pretence or knowledge of matters of state. After this oath, they exhibited the instructions they had received; and they declared that they had never heard of Sanders' passage into Ireland till they were at Rheims. This oath, they supposed, would be sufficient to content Catholics and dispassionate Protestants, and to assure them of the falsehood of the reports that were being spread; for they could never think that all these priests would make so light of their souls as to cast them away by wilful and spontaneous perjury.

But as for the Queen's Council and Bishops, whose interest it was to crush the Catholic religion and to defame its ministers, the only way against them was, if any of the fathers fell into their hands, that he should not only protest on his oath, but also stand to his denial before God and man, and challenge his adversaries to prove any single point against him,—which no man living would ever be able to do, because there never was such matter either in fact or thought. And as all this would go by unanimous verdict of a jury of twelve substantial Englishmen, they fondly hoped that a condemnation would be almost impossible, since they knew that no fact, attempt, or intention, however slight, could ever be proved.

And here one of the assembly objected, that considering the present hatred against priests, and its probable increase by the conversion of many to the faith, mere conjectures would be enough for a jury to condemn them upon. The fathers replied, that if conjectures and probabilities were to have place, it would be easy to bring conjecture against conjecture, and to refute less probabilities by greater. For instance, if foreign princes wished to send political emissaries, they would not choose mere scholars, nor send so many in so public a fashion; nor would ambassadors travel all the way from Rome afoot in servants' apparel. Again, if they were political emissaries, they must be sent to the Catholics alone; but what Catholic would ever listen to them if, after

the oath they had just taken, he were to see them meddling with matters of state?

"This," said Campion and Parsons, "is all the satisfaction we can give. And if this will not serve, we can only seal it with our blood; and if it comes to this, it will not signify whether we are believed, or whether, like our Lord and His Apostles, we are reckoned among the wicked, and put to death as the enemies of Cæsar."

The second point was practically, and for the time, the most important that this Council had to settle,—How far could it ever be lawful to go to Protestant churches, especially if the persecution should increase? Several pleas were alleged, and it was said that a man might go if he justly feared or knew that going was the one way to save his goods or person, or to redeem himself from intolerable vexation; that he would go only for external obedience to the prince and her laws, without respect to religion, just as he would go to any other profane place if commanded by the same authority, not to pray with or among the Protestants, but to repair thither only for temporal obedience. Or, if this was unlawful or not permissible, might not certain principal men, who were not likely to be hurt or infected, go thither at certain times, with protestation at their entering the churches that they went not for the sake of religion, but only by commandment of the prince, and no otherwise? Or lastly, if none of these ways were allowed, might not dispensation be had from the Pope to permit it, either generally in England, considering the difficulties and dangers that might beset such as refused, or at least to certain principal men who might have more urgent cause to ask such permission?

A negative answer was given to all these questions, and it was determined that nothing could ever justify a Catholic in attending Protestant worship in England. The religions, it was said, were different; the most learned foreign Catholics had been consulted; the Council of Trent had appointed a committee to deliberate, who had considered all the circumstances, and had come to this conclusion. The Pope was of the same mind, and would never grant a dispensation in so notorious a case, where men were called upon openly to confess or deny God's true religion by an evident and distinctive sign, and by the public act of attending an alien worship where the truth is impugned, and the Catholic Church defaced, calumniated, and ridiculed,—an iniquity in which no Catholic could acquiesce without damning his soul. The Catholic, therefore, however pressed to conform externally, ought to resist, at any peril or cost, and even to thank God

for so honourable an occasion of confessing Him, remembering that there is no dispensation from the law, "Whoever shall deny Me before men, him will I also deny before My Father."

The third point settled in the Council at Southwark was, whether the old English or the Roman rule of fasting was henceforth to prevail. In England, all Fridays were fasts, as well as several vigils that were not observed in Italy. Differences had already begun to grow in different shires, and the priests and good men could not agree about the course most proper for those days of danger. The old priests were proud of the store of national devotions and works of piety which had distinguished England above every other kingdom of the world, since St. Augustine our apostle, by command of St. Gregory, transplanted into it the flower of all the devotions that he had noted to be observed in any nation by which he passed. It was determined, therefore, that for the present nothing should be altered, in manner of fasting, from the old customs; but in the shires, wherever the different uses of York, Sarum, Hereford, or Canterbury and London used to prevail, wherever the Catholics remembered that Fridays or vigils were fasted, the same were still to be kept, and the priests were to be most forward in observing them. But where the memory had died out, no one was bound to fast, though the voluntary act was always commendable. This was not commanded, but only counselled, for direction of priests and preservation of unity, till God should open the door for an authoritative determination.

The fourth point was to determine the various districts that each priest was to frequent. It was agreed that there were three districts that ought specially to be attended to: Wales, because it was not attended to by the Protestants, or, indeed, by the Catholics; and because the ignorant inhabitants, though they had not yet apostatised from the faith, were so little attached to it that they might be led from it by the first preachers of heresy, if they were not previously strengthened by the missionaries. Secondly, Lancashire and the North, which had shown itself so forward in the Catholic cause in 1569. And thirdly, Cambridgeshire, already sapped with Puritanism, which had deeply tainted the University. To these districts the secular priests were sent. The two Jesuits seem to have been appointed to visit the whole country, for we shall trace them from London to Lancashire, and throughout the intervening places.

The last thing to be determined in the Council was the case of Mr. Cottam. He had landed at Dover with Dr. Ely,

Rishton, and Hart. But Sledd had caused a very particular description of the two last to be sent to the port, where they were stayed. Hart confessed, and was sent prisoner to London. But the mayor and searcher did not feel sure of Cottam, and so asked Dr. Ely (who under the name of Howard had passed and repassed more than once, and was not suspected) whether he would undertake to present him to Lord Cobham, the Warden of the Cinque Ports. Ely promised, and his host of Dover, who knew him as Howard, joined in giving security. But Ely thought it would be a greater offence to offer up to the persecutors an innocent priest than to break his promise to the mayor, and so let Cottam escape. But Cottam conceived some scruple about it; and so, as he still accounted himself a Jesuit, having been dismissed only for lack of health, with express promise to be again received when he was well, he sought Campion and Parsons, and told them the case. They submitted it to the Council, which, after consultation, determined that as he made no promise he was not bound to offer himself to so manifest a danger. This decision contented him for a time; but when he heard that the mayor and Dr. Ely were like to come into trouble for him, he consulted the fathers again, who this time permitted him to do as his conscience persuaded him; so with a merry countenance, and all alone, he went to the sign of the Star, in New Fish Street, and there offered himself prisoner to Mr. Andrews, a deputy of Lord Cobham, who carried him to the court, which was then at Oatlands. After three or four days he was committed to the Marshalsea, where he remained till he was arraigned and condemned for treason with Campion.

Shortly after the conclusion of this Council, Campion and Parsons entered upon the work of their mission among the country gentlemen of the shires, whom it was their great object to secure.

R. S.

Correspondence.

THE OATHS.

SIR,—In one of your late Numbers you called attention to the Irish Church Establishment. The existence of such a grievance marks Ireland as one of the most cruelly oppressed and ill-governed countries in Europe. You justly observed, that, until it be removed, “Irishmen cannot and *ought not* to be well affected to the constitution under which they live.”

In the present state of the political world, with the result of the late census on record, it is not likely that such an anomaly can long continue. The time cannot be far distant when the question for its removal must be urged upon the Legislature. There are, however, as there generally have been, Catholic members of both Houses of Parliament who would consider themselves precluded by their oath from taking part in such discussion. The absence of such members from a late memorable division in the House of Commons was fatal to the bill for the abolition of church-rates. The oaths which are now taken respectively by Catholics and Protestants, as a qualification for office, are the result of changes which from time to time have been made in former oaths; and each seems still to need further amendment. Those several former oaths, if they will not occupy too much of your valuable space, I propose to submit to your readers, and to suggest some reasons why the present ones should be further amended or repealed.

The questionable clauses of the present Catholic oath are traceable to a "declaration of principles," which was published by the Catholics of Ireland about the year 1757. Sir Henry Parnell states in his *History of the Penal Laws* (p. 49), that it was proposed by Dr. O'Keefe, Bishop of Kildare, at a meeting held at Lord Trimbleston's, "to be signed by the chiefs of their body, and published as an answer to the misrepresentations and calumnies they had laboured under since the Reformation." He adds, that it was "unanimously adopted; it was signed by many clergymen and gentlemen of rank and property, and sent to Rome as the act and deed of the Irish Catholics." It was republished in 1792.

At the time of its first publication, the oaths and declarations, required as a qualification for office, and taken and subscribed by Protestants, were the following, viz.

1. The Oath of Allegiance (1 G. c. xiii.).—"I, A. B., do sincerely promise and swear, that I will be faithful, and bear true allegiance to his Majesty King George: So help me God."

2. The Oath of Supremacy (1 G. c. xiii.).—"I, A. B., do swear, that I do from my heart abhor, detest, and abjure, as impious and heretical, that damnable doctrine and position, that princes, excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, or any authority of the see of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any other whatsoever. And I do declare that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate, hath or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, preëminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm: So help me God."

3. The Oath of Abjuration (1 G. c. xiii.).—"I, A. B., do truly and sincerely acknowledge, profess, testify, and declare in my conscience, before God and the world, that our Sovereign Lord King George is lawful and rightful king of this realm, and all other his Majesty's dominions thereunto belonging. And I do solemnly and sincerely declare, that I do believe in my conscience that the person pretended to be Prince of Wales, during the life of the late

King James, and since his decease pretending to be, and taking upon himself the style and title of King of England, by the name of James III., or of Scotland by the name of James VIII., or the style and title of King of Great Britain, hath not any right or title whatsoever to the crown of this realm, or any other the dominions thereto belonging: and I do renounce, refuse, and abjure any allegiance or obedience to him. And I do swear that I will bear faith and true allegiance to his Majesty King George, and him will defend to the utmost of my power against all traitorous conspiracies and attempts whatsoever, which shall be made against his person, crown, or dignity. And I will do my utmost endeavour to disclose and make known to his Majesty, and his successors, all treasons and traitorous conspiracies which I shall know to be against him, or any of them. And I do faithfully promise, to the utmost of my power, to support, maintain, and defend the succession of the Crown against him the said James, and all other persons whatsoever; which succession, by an Act intituled, *An Act for the further limitation of the Crown, and better securing the rights and liberties of the subject*, is and stands limited to the Princess Sophia, Electress and Duchess Dowager of Hanover, and the heirs of her body, being Protestants. And all these things I do plainly and sincerely acknowledge and swear, according to these express words by me spoken, and according to the plain and common sense and understanding of the same words, without any equivocation, mental evasion, or secret reservation whatsoever. And I do make this recognition, acknowledgment, abjuration, renunciation, and promise, heartily, willingly, and truly, upon the true faith of a Christian: So help me God."

4. The Declaration against Transubstantiation (25 Ch. II. c. ii.).—"I, A. B., do declare, that I do believe that there is not any transubstantiation in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or in the elements of bread and wine, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever."

5. The Declaration against Popery (30 Ch. II. c. i.).—"I, A. B., do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do believe, that in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever: and that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary, or any other saint, and the sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous: And I do solemnly in the presence of God profess, testify, and declare that I do make this declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words read unto me, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatsoever, and without any dispensation already granted me for this purpose by the Pope, or any other authority or person whatsoever, or without any hope of any such dispensa-

tion from any person or authority whatsoever, or without thinking that I am or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration, or any part thereof, although the Pope, or any other person, or persons, or power whatsoever, shall dispense with, or annul the same, or declare that it was null and void from the beginning."

The Declaration of the Irish Catholics was as follows :

"Whereas certain opinions and principles, inimical to good order and government, have been attributed to the Catholics, the existence of which we utterly deny ; and whereas it is at this time peculiarly necessary to remove such imputations, and to give the most full and ample satisfaction to our Protestant brethren that we hold no principle whatsoever incompatible with our duty as men or as subjects, or repugnant to liberty, whether political, civil, or religious.

"Now we, the Catholics of Ireland, for the removal of all such imputations, and in deference to the opinion of many respectable bodies of men and individuals among our Protestant brethren, do hereby, in the face of our country, of all Europe, and before God, make this our deliberate and solemn declaration :

"1. We abjure, disavow, and condemn the opinion that princes excommunicated by the Pope and council, or by any ecclesiastical authority whatsoever, may therefore be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any other persons. We hold such doctrine in detestation as wicked and impious ; and we declare that we do not believe that either the Pope, with or without a general council, or any prelate or priest, or any ecclesiastical power whatsoever, can absolve the subjects of this kingdom, or any of them, from their allegiance to his Majesty King George the Second, who is by authority of Parliament the lawful king of this realm.

"2. We abjure, condemn, and detest, as unchristian and impious, the principle that it is lawful to murder, destroy, or any ways injure any person whatsoever, for or under the pretence of being heretics ; and we declare solemnly before God that we believe that no act in itself unjust, immoral, or wicked, can ever be justified or excused by or under pretence or colour that it was done either for the good of the Church or in obedience to any ecclesiastical power whatsoever.

"3. We further declare, that we hold it as an unchristian and impious principle that 'no faith is to be kept with heretics.' This doctrine we detest and reprobate, not only as contrary to our religion, but as destructive of morality, of society, and even of common honesty ; and it is our firm belief that an oath made to any person not of the Catholic religion is equally binding as if it were made to any Catholic whatsoever.

"4. We have been charged with holding, as an article of our belief, that the Pope, with or without the authority of a general council, or that certain ecclesiastical powers, can acquit and absolve us before God from our oath of allegiance, or even from the just oaths and contracts entered into between man and man.

"Now we do utterly renounce, abjure, and deny that we hold or maintain any such belief, as being contrary to the peace and happiness of society, inconsistent with morality, and above all repugnant to the true spirit of the Catholic religion.

"5. We do further declare, that we do not believe that the Pope of Rome, or any other prince, prelate, state, or potentate, hath or ought to have, any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority, or præminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm.

"6. After what we have renounced, it is immaterial, in a political light, what may be our opinion or faith in other points respecting the Pope ; however, for greater satisfaction, we declare that it is not an article of the Catholic faith, neither are we thereby required to believe or profess that the Pope is infallible, or that we are bound to obey any order in its own nature immoral, though the Pope, or any ecclesiastical power, should issue or direct such order ; but, on the contrary, we hold that it would be sinful in us to pay any respect or obedience thereto.

"7. We further declare, that we do not believe that any sin whatsoever committed by us can be forgiven at the mere will of any Pope, or of any priest, or of any person or persons whatsoever ; but that sincere sorrow for past sins, a firm and sincere resolution, as far as may be in our power, to restore our neighbour's property or character, if we have trespassed on or unjustly injured either ; a firm and sincere resolution to avoid future guilt, and to atone to God, are previous and indispensable requisites to establish a well-founded expectation of forgiveness ; and that any person who receives absolution without these previous requisites, so far from obtaining thereby any remission of his sins, incurs the additional guilt of violating a sacrament.

"8. We do hereby solemnly disclaim and for ever renounce all interest in and title to all forfeited lands resulting from any rights, or supposed rights, of our ancestors, or any claim, title, or interest therein ; nor do we admit any title, as a foundation of right, which is not established and acknowledged by the laws of the realm as they now stand. We desire further that whenever the patriotism, liberality, and justice of our countrymen shall restore to us a participation in the elective franchise, no Catholic shall be permitted to vote at any election for members to serve in Parliament until he shall previously take an oath to defend to the utmost of his power the arrangement of property in this country, as established by the different acts of attainder and settlement.

"9. It has been objected to us, that we wish to subvert the present Church establishment, for the purpose of substituting a Catholic establishment in its stead. Now we do hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any such intention ; and further, if we shall be admitted into any share of the constitution, by our being restored to the right of elective franchise, we are ready, in the most solemn manner, to declare that we will not exercise that privilege to disturb and weaken the establishment of the Protestant religion, or Protestant government in this country."

The first Catholic Relief Act for Ireland (13 and 14 G. III. c. xxxv.) was passed by the Irish Parliament in the year 1774. The oath which it prescribed was reenacted in several subsequent Acts : and was the only Catholic oath for Ireland till 1793, and, with a few unimportant modifications, the only one for Great Britain till 1829. In the Irish Relief Act of 1793, which conferred on the Irish Catholics the elective franchise, an additional oath was prescribed. It was drawn up by Dr. Duigenan, an inveterate opponent of the Catholic claims, avowedly from the "Declaration," which had been republished the year before, and was afterwards called Dr. Duigenan's oath. The two oaths were the following :

1. The Catholic Oath of 1774 (13 and 14 G. III. c. xxxv).—
 "I, A. B., do take Almighty God and His only Son Jesus Christ, my Redeemer, to witness that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to our most gracious Sovereign Lord King George the Third, and him will defend, to the utmost of my power, against all conspiracies and attempts whatever that shall be made against his person, crown, and dignity ; and I will do my utmost endeavour to disclose and make known to his Majesty, and his heirs, all treasons and traitorous conspiracies which may be formed against him or them : (2.) And I do faithfully promise to maintain, support, and defend, to the utmost of my power, the succession of the crown in his Majesty's family against any person or persons whatsoever ; hereby utterly renouncing and abjuring any obedience or allegiance unto the person taking upon himself the style and title of Prince of Wales in the lifetime of his father, and who since his death is said to have assumed the style and title of King of Great Britain and Ireland by the name of Charles the Third, and to any other person claiming or pretending a right to the crown of these realms : (3.) And I do swear that I do reject and detest as unchristian and impious to believe, that it is lawful to murder or destroy any person or persons whatsoever, for or under pretence of their being heretics, and also that unchristian and impious principle, that no faith is to be kept with heretics : (4.) I further declare, that it is no article of my faith, and that I do renounce, reject, and abjure the opinion that princes excommunicated by the Pope and council, or by any authority of the See of Rome, or by any authority whatsoever, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or by any person whatsoever ; and I do promise that I will not hold, maintain, or abet, any such opinion, or any other opinion, contrary to what is expressed in this declaration : (5.) And I do declare that I do not believe that the Pope of Rome,* or any other foreign prince, prelate, state, or potentate, hath, or ought to have, any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority, or preëminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm : (6.) And I do solemnly in the presence of God, and of His only Son Jesus Christ, my Redeemer, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this de-

* Neither the expression "the Pope of Rome," nor the subsequent terms "directly or indirectly," occur in any corresponding Protestant oath. They appear to have been taken from the foregoing "Declaration."

claration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words of this oath, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatever, and without any dispensation already granted by the Pope, or any authority of the See of Rome, or any person whatever ; and without thinking that I am, or can be, acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration, or any part thereof, although the Pope, or any other person or persons, or authority whatsoever, shall dispense with, or annul the same, or declare that it was null and void from the beginning : So help me God."

2. The oath commonly called Dr. Duigenan's oath (33 G. III., c. xxi.).—"I, A. B., do hereby declare that I do profess the Roman Catholic Religion. I, A. B., do swear that I do abjure, condemn, and detest, as unchristian and impious, the principle that it is lawful to murder, destroy, or anyways injure, any person whatsoever for or under the pretence of being an heretic; and I do declare solemnly before God that I believe that no act in itself unjust, immoral, or wicked, can ever be justified or excused by or under pretence or colour that it was done either for the good of the Church, or in obedience to any ecclesiastical authority whatsoever : (2.) I also declare that it is not an article of the Catholic faith, neither am I thereby required to believe or profess that the Pope is infallible, or that I am bound to obey any order in its own nature immoral, though the Pope or any ecclesiastical power should issue or direct such order ; but on the contrary, I hold that it would be sinful in me to pay any respect or obedience thereto : (3.) I further declare that I do not believe that any sin whatsoever committed by me can be forgiven at the mere will of any Pope, or of any priest, or of any person or persons whatsoever ; but that sincere sorrow for past sins, a firm and sincere resolution to avoid future guilt, and to atone to God, are previous and indispensable requisites to establish a well founded expectation of forgiveness ; and that any person who receives absolution without these previous requisites, so far from obtaining thereby any remission of his sins, incurs the additional guilt of violating a sacrament : (4.) And I do swear that I will defend to the utmost of my power the settlement and arrangement of property in this country as established by the laws now in being : (5.) I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the present Church Establishment for the purpose of substituting a Catholic Establishment in its stead : (6.) And I do solemnly swear that I will not exercise any privilege to which I am or may become entitled to disturb and weaken the Protestant religion and Protestant government in this country : So help me God."

The Act for the establishment and partial endowment of the "Academy" of Maynooth (35 G. III. c. xxi.), entitled *An Act for the better education of persons professing the Popish or Roman Catholic Religion*, was passed by the Irish Parliament in the year 1795. The oath which it prescribed for the trustees and other officers, &c.

was that of 1774. The 8th clause of the Act provides, "That no person professing the Roman Catholic religion shall act as a trustee to the said Academy, and that no person shall act as a president of the said Academy, and that no person shall act as a master, fellow, professor, teacher, or tutor, or enjoy any place on the foundation of the said Academy, or be otherwise admitted into the same as a student, officer, or servant, until he shall have taken and subscribed the oath appointed by the Act passed in the thirteenth and fourteenth years of his Majesty's reign, entitled *An Act to enable his Majesty's subjects of whatever persuasion to testify their allegiance to him.*" In the year 1829 the present Catholic oath, common to the United Kingdom (10 G. IV. c. vii.), was substituted for it.

The two principal Catholic Relief Acts for England (18 G. III. c. lx., and 33 G. III. c. xxxii.) were passed respectively by the British Parliament in the years 1778 and 1791. The oaths prescribed by each respectively, subject to certain alterations and omissions,* were the same as the Irish oath of 1774.

Some time, however, before the Bill for the latter was submitted to Parliament, the Government appears to have had some misgiving as to whether the oaths and declarations of the British and Irish Catholics respecting the prerogatives of the Holy See were in accordance with the principles of the Catholic religion as believed and professed in Catholic countries; and Mr. Pitt had expressed to certain members of the Catholic Committee a wish that they would furnish him with "authentic evidence of the opinions of the Ca-

* The differences between the Irish oath of 1774 and the English oath of 1778 are these: In the first clause the English oath commences: "I, A. B., do sincerely promise and swear that I will be faithful," &c.; instead of "our Most Gracious Sovereign Lord," it has "his Majesty;" instead of "*and dignity,*" it has "*or dignity,*" and instead of "his Majesty and his heirs," it has "his Majesty, his heirs and successors." In the second clause the words "*and Ireland*" are omitted; in the third, instead of "*as unchristian and impious to believe,*" it has "*as an unchristian and impious position;*" in the fourth, the passage "*and I do promise that I will not hold, maintain, or abet,*" &c., is omitted; and in the sixth, the words "*and of his only Son, Jesus Christ, my Redeemer,*" the words "*or persons,*" and the words "*from the beginning*" are omitted.

The differences between the Irish oath of 1774 and the English oath of 1791 are these: In the first clause the English oath of 1791 is the same as that of 1778; in the second, instead of "his Majesty's family, against any person or persons whatsoever," we read "*which succession, by an Act intituled An Act for the further limitation of the Crown, and better securing the rights and liberties of the subject, is and stands limited to the Princess Sophia, Electress and Duchess Dowager of Hanover, and the heirs of her body, being Protestants;*" and the whole passage relating to the Stuarts, beginning with the words "the person," and ending with the words "and to," is omitted; in the third, instead of "*as unchristian and impious to believe,*" we read "*as an unchristian and impious position;*" and twice after the word "*heretics*" are added the words "*or infidels;*" the fourth clause begins with "*And I further declare,*" &c., and in the course of the clause the word "*by*" before "*any authority of the See of Rome*" is omitted; and in the sixth the omissions are the same as in the former oath; and instead of "*null and void,*" the words are "*null or void.*"

tholic Clergy and Catholic Universities with respect to the existence or extent of the Pope's dispensing power."

In pursuance of this request, three questions were sent to the universities of Paris, Louvain, Douay, Alcala, Salamanca, and Valladolid. The questions were the following, viz.

"1. Has the Pope or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, any civil authority, power, jurisdiction, or preëminence whatsoever, within the realm of England?"

"2. Can the Pope or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, absolve, or dispense with his Majesty's subjects from their oath of allegiance, upon any pretext whatsoever?"

"3. Is there any principle in the tenets of the Catholic faith by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or other persons differing from them in religious opinions, in any transaction either of a public or a private nature?"

These several questions were all answered by each university in the negative. The answers, with the arguments and authorities in support of them, are given in full in the Appendix to the second volume of Mr. Butler's *Historical Memoirs of the English Catholics*; they occupy more than forty pages. A few extracts from the first three answers to the first and second questions may probably suffice as specimens, and at the present time may be both interesting and instructive.

LOUVAIN.

"The Faculty of Divinity of Louvain, having been requested to give her opinion upon the questions above stated, does it with readiness; but is struck with astonishment that such questions should, at the end of this eighteenth century, be proposed to any learned body by inhabitants of a kingdom that glories in the talents and discernment of its natives.

"The Faculty being assembled for the above purpose, it is agreed, with the unanimous consent of all voices, to answer the first and second queries absolutely in the negative.

". . . The Faculty esteems the following propositions to be beyond controversy.

"1. That God is the author of the sovereign power of the State in civil matters.

"2. That the sovereign power of the State is, in civil matters, subordinate to God alone.

"3. It follows, that the sovereign power of the State is in no wise (not even indirectly, as it is termed) subject to, or dependent upon, any other power, though it be a spiritual power, or even though it be instituted for eternal salvation.

"4. It also follows, that no power whatsoever, even a spiritual power, or a power instituted for eternal salvation, not even a Cardinal or a Pope, or the whole body of the Church, though assembled

in general council, can deprive the sovereign power of the State of its temporal rights, possessions, government, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence, or subject it to any restraints or modifications.

"5. It also follows, that no man, nor any assembly of men, however eminent in dignity and power, not even the whole body of the Catholic Church, though assembled in general council, can, upon any ground or pretence whatsoever, weaken the bond of union between the sovereign and the people, still less can they absolve or free the subjects from their oath of allegiance.

"6. Therefore, as in the kingdom of England, the sovereign power of the State stands upon the same foundation, and its nature is well known, the Faculty of Divinity at Louvain has no doubt to apply what has been said before, in its utmost extent, to the kingdom of England.

"Such is the doctrine which the Faculty of Divinity has imbibed from the Holy Scriptures, from the writings of the ancients, and the records of the primitive Church; a doctrine she will maintain with her last breath, and, by the help of God, will imprint it on the minds of all her scholars.

* * * * *

"The Faculty of Divinity of Louvain holds, that the principles laid down by her upon the positions before stated are not peculiar to herself; she believes that at this day there is no society of learned men, nor any one learned man, in the whole Catholic world who would not be ready to subscribe to them, as it is said, with both hands; and should any one, led away by preconceived opinions, withhold his assent from them, she must think him a man of no learning, unworthy of the name of a learned man, and unacquainted with the rich treasures of ancient literature.

"Given at Louvain, in an Assembly Extraordinary, this 18th November 1788."

DOUAY.

"Jan. 5, 1789.—At a meeting of the Faculty of Divinity of the University of Douay, &c.

"These questions first having been privately considered by each professor of divinity, and afterwards having been attentively discussed by the public meeting:

"To the first and second of them, the Sacred Faculty answers, that no power whatsoever, in civil or temporal concerns, was given by the Almighty either to the Pope, the Cardinals, or the Church herself; and consequently that kings and sovereigns are not, in temporal concerns, subject by the ordination of God to any ecclesiastical power whatsoever; neither can their subjects, by any authority granted to the Pope or the Church from above, be freed from their obedience, or absolved from their oath of allegiance.

"This is the doctrine which the doctors and professors of divinity hold and teach in our schools; and this all the candidates for degrees in divinity maintain in their public theses."

PARIS.

"1. Neither the Pope, nor the Cardinals, nor any body of men, nor any other person of the Church of Rome, hath any civil authority, civil power, civil jurisdiction, or civil preëminence whatsoever in any kingdom, and consequently none in the kingdom of England, by reason or virtue of any authority, power, or jurisdiction, or preëminence by Divine institution, inherent in, or granted, or by any other means belonging to, the Pope or the Church of Rome.

"This doctrine the Sacred Faculty of Divinity of Paris has always held, and upon every occasion maintained; and upon every occasion has rigidly proscribed the contrary doctrines from her schools.

"2. Neither the Pope, nor the Cardinals, nor any body of men, nor any person of the Church of Rome, can by virtue of the keys absolve or free the subjects of the King of England from their oath of allegiance.

"This and the first quære are so intimately connected, that the answer to the first immediately and naturally applies to the second.

"Given at Paris, in the General Assembly of the Sorbonne, held on Thursday, the 11th day before the Calends of March 1789."

The answers were sent to Mr. Pitt, and in 1791 an ample Relief Act was passed. It repealed most, if not all, of the penal enactments which prohibited the free exercise of the Catholic religion, and was afterwards not unfrequently called the Catholic Toleration Act.

From the two preceding oaths, viz. the Irish oath of 1774, with its English modifications, and the oath called Dr. Duigenan's oath, Sir Robert Peel compiled the present Catholic oath for the United Kingdom. It was enacted by the Catholic Relief Act of 1829 (10 G. IV. c. vii.); and by the same act the Protestant Declaration against Transubstantiation and the Declaration against Popery cited at the commencement of this letter (except with regard to certain offices from which Catholics are still excluded) were abrogated. The oath, *mutatis mutandis*, is as follows:

"I, A. B., do sincerely promise and swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to her Majesty Queen Victoria, and will defend her to the utmost of my power against all conspiracies and attempts whatever which shall be made against her person, crown, or dignity; and I will do my utmost endeavour to disclose and make known to her Majesty, her heirs and successors, all treasons and traitorous conspiracies which may be formed against her or them; (2) And I do faithfully promise to maintain, support, and defend, to the utmost of my power, the succession of the crown, which succession, by an act intituled *An Act for the further Limitation of the Crown, and better securing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject*, is, and stands limited to the Princess Sophia Electress of

Hanover, and the heirs of her body, being Protestants ; hereby utterly renouncing and abjuring any obedience or allegiance unto any other person claiming or pretending a right to the crown of this realm ; (3) And I do further declare, that it is not an article of my faith, and that I do renounce, reject, and abjure the opinion that princes excommunicated or deprived by the Pope, or any other authority of the See of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or by any person whatsoever ; (4) And I do declare, that I do not believe that the Pope of Rome, or any other foreign prince, prelate, person, state, or potentate, hath, or ought to have any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority, or preëminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm ; (5) I do swear, that I will defend to the utmost of my power the settlement of property within this realm, as established by the laws ; (6) And I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure, any intention to subvert the present Church Establishment as settled by law within this realm ; (7) And I do solemnly swear, that I never will exercise any privilege to which I am or may become entitled to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion or Protestant government in the United Kingdom ; (8) And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words of this oath, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatsoever : So help me God."

The fourth clause had been substituted for the Protestant Oath of Supremacy in the first Catholic Relief Act of 1774, and was afterwards adopted in all the subsequent ones for Ireland in 1778, 1782, 1792, and 1793, and in those for England in 1778 and 1791 ; and had probably been taken from the Declaration of the Irish Catholics. It was not a new modification of the Oath of Supremacy ; and it appears somewhat strange that Sir Robert Peel did not notice this circumstance, and other changes which had been made in the Oath of Supremacy, as taken by Protestants, in an interview with George IV., the day before he submitted to Parliament the outline of his intended measures. He informs us in his *Memoirs* (vol. i. p. 343) that the king had commanded himself, the Duke of Wellington, and the Lord Chancellor, to attend his Majesty at Windsor, . . . and "desired to receive from them a more complete and detailed explanation of the manner in which they proposed to effect the object they had in view ;" and that having learned from them that they "proposed to repeal altogether the declaration against transubstantiation, and to modify in the case of Roman Catholics that part of the Oath of Supremacy which relates to the spiritual and ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Pope, he seemed much surprised, and said rapidly and earnestly, 'What is this ?—you surely do not mean to alter the 'ancient' oath of supremacy ?'" They explained to him that "to all his subjects, excepting the Roman Catholics, the oath should be administered in its [then] present form ; and that the Roman Catholics should be required to declare on oath that no foreign prince or prelate hath any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power,

superiority, or preëminence within this realm." They added that "if the Roman Catholic was still required, before his admission to office or Parliament, to declare his belief that no foreign prelate hath or ought to have any spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdiction, power, or preëminence, within this realm, the measure of relief would be un-availing, that an effectual impediment to the enjoyment of civil privileges would remain unremoved. The king observed, that be that as it might, he could not possibly consent to any alteration of the 'ancient' oath of supremacy."

Sir Robert Peel states that the interview lasted for five hours, and that there was uninterrupted conversation during the whole time ; but it does not appear that they once informed or reminded his Majesty that, for the Catholics, the oath had already been altered more than fifty years, and that during that period Catholics had taken it in the altered form and no other.

The result of the interview was that they resigned their several offices. In the evening, however, the king wrote to the Duke of Wellington, requesting them to withdraw their resignation, and allowing them to proceed with the measures, of which notice had been given in Parliament. The measures were accordingly proceeded with, and the oath was enacted in its present form.

The Oath of Supremacy, however, in its then present form, was not so ancient as the king seemed to suppose. The oath was originally affirmative as well as negative; it not only denied the supremacy of the Pope, it also asserted that of the crown. Three several oaths to that effect were enacted within the first ten years after the schismatical assumption of the supremacy by Henry VIII., which were abrogated in the reign of Queen Mary (1 and 2 Phil. and Mar. c. i.). The form enacted in the first year of Elizabeth's reign (1 Eliz. c. i.) is as follows :

"I, A. B., do utterly testify and declare in my conscience that the Queen's Highness is the only supreme governor of this realm, and of all other her Highness's dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal, and that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate, hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, preëminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm; and therefore I do utterly renounce and forsake all foreign jurisdictions, powers, superiorities, and authorities, and do promise that from henceforth I shall bear faith and true allegiance to the Queen's Highness, her heirs and lawful successors, and to my power shall assist and defend all jurisdictions, preëminences, privileges, and authorities granted or belonging to the Queen's Highness, her heirs and successors, or united or annexed to the imperial crown of this realm : So help me God, and by the contents of this book."

By an Act passed in the third year of the reign of James I. (c. iv.), an additional and longer oath, to be tendered to recusants, was prescribed. It contained the following clause : "And I do further swear, that I do from my heart abhor, detest, and abjure, as

impious and heretical, this damnable doctrine and position, that princes which be excommunicated or deprived by the Pope may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any other whatsoever." And by a further Act passed in the first year of the reign of William and Mary (c. viii.), the two oaths were both of them abrogated,* and a form, extracted partly from each, was substituted in their place. It was reënacted in the first year of the reign of George I., and is the form cited in the commencement of this letter. This also was abrogated in the year 1858.

The Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy which is now taken by Protestants is the following:

"I, A. B., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance," &c. (2.) "And I do faithfully promise to maintain, support, and defend, to the utmost of my power, the succession of the Crown, which succession," &c. (3.) "And I do declare that no foreign prince, person, prelate," &c. (4.) "And I make this declaration upon the true faith of a Christian: so help me God."

This oath is prescribed by an Act which was passed in the year 1858, intituled *An Act to substitute one Oath for the Oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy, and Abjuration; and for the Relief of her Majesty's Subjects professing the Jewish Religion*. It was wished by Catholics at the time that the third clause might be so worded as not to clash with Catholic principles, and that one and the same oath might be common to all parties. This, however, was refused; and by the sixth clause of the Act it is expressly provided, "that nothing in this Act contained shall be held to alter or affect the provisions of an Act passed in the tenth year of King George the Fourth," c. vii., *For the Relief of his Majesty's Roman Catholic Subjects*.

The third clause of this oath, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words, is unquestionably false. When it was tendered to Mr. O'Connell (in the former Oath of Supremacy), on his presenting himself to take his seat, as member for Clare, in the House of Commons, he openly declared that "it contained one proposition which he knew to be false, and another which he believed to be untrue, and therefore he refused to take it." (*Hansard*, Tuesday, May 19, 1829). Those two propositions have reference, one to a question

* Since the abrogation of Elizabeth's Oath of Supremacy, the clergy of the Establishment are the only parties who are required positively to acknowledge the supremacy of the Crown. By the 35th of the "Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical" of the Church of England, "no person shall hereafter be received into the ministry . . . except he shall first subscribe" three several articles, the first of which is the following, viz. "That the Queen's Majesty, under God, is the only supreme Governor of this realm, and of all other her Highness's dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal; and that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate, hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, preëminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within her Majesty's said realms, dominions, and countries." The form of subscription is as follows: "I, N. N., do willingly and *ex animo*, subscribe to these three articles, and to all things that are contained in them."

of fact, the other to a question of right. With regard to the question of fact, viz. whether a foreign prince, or prelate, &c., *hath* jurisdiction, &c., the oath is as false when taken by a Protestant as it would be if taken by a Catholic. Its terms are so comprehensive, that if any one foreign prince, *or* prelate, &c., had any jurisdiction, *or* power, &c., ecclesiastical *or* spiritual, within this realm, how trivial soever such jurisdiction might be, and although it might be recognised but by one individual, the oath would of course be false. The well-known truth, however, is, that a foreign prince and prelate *hath* jurisdiction, *and* power, *and* superiority, *and* preëminence, *and* authority, both ecclesiastical *and* spiritual, within this realm; and whether his jurisdiction be considered in itself with reference to its own intrinsic nature, or with reference to the subjects over whom it is exercised (though it does not in the slightest degree trespass on the temporal or civil jurisdiction of the Queen), it is more comprehensive and of greater extent than any jurisdiction of a similar nature which is exercised or held by any *domestic* prince or prelate, or by all the domestic prelates together, with the sovereignty of the realm at their head.

On what plea, then, it may be asked, or in what sense, do Protestants unscrupulously take the oath? They take it with a mental reservation, in a limited sense, which the words do not authorise; in a sense, indeed, in which Catholics might almost take it, viz. that "no foreign prince, &c. hath any jurisdiction," &c. *which he can enforce by law in any temporal or civil court*, "within this realm." In this limited sense, and with a similar mental reservation (if mental reservation in an oath be allowable), the oath might be taken by a Catholic as safely at least as the corresponding clause in the present Catholic oath. It amounts in reality to nothing more than a disclaimer of the Pope's temporal or civil jurisdiction. His Holiness the Pope could not possibly enforce any act of jurisdiction in any temporal or civil court, unless he had such a court within this realm; and to have such a court would necessarily imply that he had temporal or civil jurisdiction. Now the Catholic oath expressly declares that he neither hath, nor ought to have, any temporal or civil jurisdiction, directly or indirectly, within this realm. But may it not perhaps be urged that the oath means nothing more than what Protestants understand by it? What an *oath* means is one thing, what the *parties who take it* mean may be another. An *oath* means what *its terms express*; and there is no authoritative or "legislative interpretation"* assigning to the oath in question any other than its literal meaning.

* Sir Robert Peel observes in his *Memoirs* (vol. i. p. 304), that in the [Catholic Relief] Bill brought in by Mr. Plunket, in 1821, "it was originally proposed to retain the [then] present oath of supremacy, and to require the Roman Catholic to take that oath, as a condition of his holding office, *there being inserted in the Bill a legislative interpretation of the oath*, importing that those who might take the oath should be understood to declare nothing more than they denied to any foreign prince any jurisdiction, temporal or spiritual, that could conflict with their duty of full and undivided allegiance. The Bill

With regard to the Catholic oath, I need not trouble your readers with any detailed explanation of its provisions. Catholics are not agreed respecting them, and there is no duly authorised interpreter. According to some parties, its questionable clauses have no practical meaning, and were never intended by its framers and proposers to affect members of Parliament in their legislative capacity. In the opinion of others, the self-same clauses have a restrictive meaning; and neither the oath itself, nor the Act which prescribes it, makes any exception in favour of members of Parliament. They consider that by the 6th and 7th clauses members of Parliament are morally debarred from speaking or voting in favour of any measures which are calculated to injure the Church establishment, or otherwise to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion. And if their opinion is correct, the oath is at variance with the principles of the Constitution; Catholic members, with regard to certain questions, are virtually disqualified; they are not on an equal footing with their Protestant fellow-members; they are, as it were, but half-members of Parliament; and their constituents are but half represented. These are so many unconstitutional anomalies; and before another Bill for the abolition of church-rates, or for any other such beneficial measure, be lost, the oath ought to be either satisfactorily explained or repealed.

Oaths ought not to be nugatory, nor too comprehensive; they ought to express neither more nor less than they are intended to mean. The present oaths of office are defective in these respects. The Catholic oath is either a nullity or an unconstitutional grievance; and the Protestant oath, as O'Connell observed, contains one proposition which all the world "knows to be false," and another which most Christians "believe to be untrue." Both the oaths ought to be abrogated; and the only oath which should be substituted for them, to be taken by Catholics and Protestants alike, should be one short and simple test of civil and constitutional allegiance.

T. L. G.

Literary Notices.

The Christian Church and Society in 1861. By F. Guizot. (London: Bentley, 1861.) M. Guizot's work is divided, in substance though not in form, into three parts: an appeal to Protestants, and especially French Protestants, to make common cause with Catholics in resisting the advances of rationalism; an argument that the preservation of religious liberty in Europe is essentially connected with the maintenance of the temporal power of the Pope;

was afterwards altered in this respect; and . . . the legislative interpretation was abandoned." Sir Robert adds, that he thinks "an alteration of the oath preferable to a legislative interpretation."

and a condemnation of the part which the Piedmontese Government has taken in the Italian Revolution. With the first of these we are not concerned. M. Guizot's appeal to his co-religionists has failed, and it is therefore needless to discuss the terms, or to speculate on the consequences, of such an alliance as he suggests. But we cannot altogether sympathise with him on either of the other two points. We should be among the last to quarrel with his strictures on the Piedmontese policy; but we cannot regard the creation of an Italian Confederacy as a legitimate object for the active intrigue of foreign nations. We may doubt the possibility of any other satisfactory solution of existing difficulties, and we certainly execrate the means by which the Piedmontese Cabinet has sought to carry its own conclusions into effect; but the choice between a confederation and a monarchy must lie ultimately with the Italians themselves. If, to use M. Guizot's words, "when millions of people have borne for ages the same name, spoken the same language, regarded the same eminent men as their fathers, and the same masterpieces of mind as their common glory, it is an ungracious task to refuse their intimate relationship and title as a nation," it is hardly less so to prescribe the exact character and limits which that relationship shall assume, even though it may take a form "equally repugnant to French interests and principles." Nor do we think that M. Guizot has proved his point with respect to the temporal power of the Pope. It is obvious that any satisfactory settlement of the Roman question must, in the first instance, secure two things: Catholics must have a guarantee for the perfect freedom of the Holy See in its communications with them; and statesmen must have a guarantee that none of the great powers shall have an exclusive, or even a greatly preponderating, influence on the Papal policy. Of course, any interference with the first of these requisites would be an interference with the constitution of the Catholic Church, and therefore, *ipso facto*, an interference with the religious liberty of Catholics. But M. Guizot goes far beyond this. He asserts, if we understand him rightly, that the continuance of the temporal power of the Holy See, in the form which it has hitherto assumed, is necessary for the religious freedom of Catholics in other countries; that without it they could have no security for the liberty of organisation, the liberty of association, or the liberty of instruction. If this be so, we are driven to the conclusion that the only possible security is at best an indifferent one. It has not prevented the confiscation of monasteries in Piedmont, the prohibition against receiving novices in Spain, or the interference with the Society of St. Vincent of Paul in France. The freedom of the Holy See must be upheld on its own grounds; but its temporal power is altogether a different thing, and M. Guizot himself says that the true secret of the preservation of religious liberty in the different countries of Europe is "the provident union, the free speech, and the active courage of sound minds and honest hearts."

But it is difficult to reconcile the indispensable conditions of

liberty with the revolution. The revolution teaches that a government, however good, may be subverted by its subjects; while the revolution lasts, therefore, good government is no security for the Holy See, and the Pope must depend on foreign aid.

The revolution also "proclaims the right of larger to absorb smaller states, on the pretexts of the wish of the population, of nationality or ethnological connexion, and of rectification of frontiers. Therefore the Pope can no more depend on his neighbours than on his own subjects. The revolution also proclaims the doctrine of non-intervention; that is, it forbids strangers to intermeddle in the intestine broils of a people, or in the quarrels of kindred and neighbouring nations and races. Therefore, while the revolution lasts, the Pope cannot depend on foreign aid, whether of his neighbours or of distant states.

Again, the guarantee of the liberty of the Pope in the middle ages was his authority over all the faithful. When this failed, the Borgias and Julius II. set up the temporal sovereignty, and guaranteed the stability of the States of the Church by a system of alliances which developed into the theory of the balance of power. But alliances depend on treaties; and treaties are useless when they are not held to be binding. But the revolution holds that treaties are not binding when they are inconvenient to the State; therefore the guarantee which the Popes had in the "balance of power" for the independence of their State (which State was, in its turn, the guarantee of their spiritual independence) is lost while the revolution lasts. The question that European statesmen have to settle now is, what system is to be substituted for that of the balance of power, supposing that system to be henceforth impossible, and what, under the new system, is to be the guarantee of the spiritual independence of the Pope? We cannot say that M. Guizot's essay throws much light on this, which is the real obscurity of the present political night.

Dr. Stanley has published his *Speech delivered in the House of Congregation, on the Endowment of the Regius Professorship of Greek*, at Oxford. It is short and to the point, and in its concluding sentences refers to a fact which, were it not for the infatuation which sometimes seizes on religious communities, would fill the supporters of Anglicanism with the deepest apprehensions. "No one," says Dr. Stanley, "can regret more deeply than I do the unsettled state of belief in the rising generation, *or the steadily increasing alienation of our best and ablest young men from the profession of holy orders.*" The words which we have marked in italics do, indeed, only repeat a statement with which we have long been familiar; but it is instructive to find it thus prominently brought before the University of Oxford by one of her most distinguished professors. There can be no doubt that the Church of England is becoming less and less a religious power in the State. We do not say that she is becoming less of a social, or educational, or political power; but that as a teacher of a theological creed she is rapidly

losing all influence on the minds of the more educated classes of society. Few things can be more suggestive of some irresistible internal convulsion in a religious body than an increasing alienation of earnest and thoughtful minds from its ministry. Up to the present generation, the influence of the Anglican Church has, on the whole, gone to maintain the substance of that theology which she holds in common with Catholicism, with the Oriental Churches, and with those who term themselves the orthodox Dissenters.

That the intellect of England is gradually ceasing to regard that system with any prepossession in its favour, is shown, as by many other phenomena, so especially by this distaste for a well-paid and respectable profession. What will be the results on the moral and social *life* of English society no eye can foresee. For ourselves, we cannot but think that it may be of the most serious description.

It is not, again, merely the ablest young men who decline the clerical profession. Dr. Stanley says it is "the *best* and ablest." Why is this? We believe that the cause is, to a great extent, to be found in the attitude of the dominant parties of the clergy of the Establishment. Whatever they may say to the contrary, they leave the impression on the zealous and youthful mind *that they are afraid of truth*, afraid of facts, afraid of reasoning, and afraid of toleration. Hence the young graduate hesitates to commit himself to the professional upholding of a system which he shrewdly suspects may be neither more nor less than a conventional creed, adapted to the ignorance and superstition of the unenlightened, but unable to command the belief of the well-informed. That this is the natural result of the attitude assumed by the Anglican prelates and clergy in power can hardly be disputed. But woe be to the religious community wherein stupidity, dulness, and wilful obscurantism hold the highest places! Prudence is one thing, timidity is another. Genius may not always be the best qualification for high office, especially in ecclesiastical matters; but one thing is necessary for those who would retain the allegiance of the young mind of England, namely, a courageous readiness to face facts, to meet difficulties, instead of shirking them, and a cordial sympathy with the difficulties of those who, if they are liable to be warped by enthusiasm and novelty, are certain to be repelled by coldness and unfairness on the part of those who govern them. As we see little sign that the high places in the Anglican Church are likely to be filled by men who can master the difficulties of their position, we cannot but anticipate a general loosening of religious bonds throughout the entire fabric of English society.

Horæ Subsecivæ. By John Brown, M.D. Second Series. Dr. Brown is a man well worth listening to, notwithstanding two tiresome infirmities which have annoyed us as we read his volumes. He keeps a commonplace book, and floods us with quotations from it; and he tends unmistakably to the emphatic and exaggerated school of North-British eloquence. There is a pretension about

many of these clever papers which is unworthy of a writer who has so much in him, and who appears to be a thorough, genuine man, even if not altogether a "full man." Moreover, he has so keen a sense, not only of a good joke, but also of the beautiful and poetical, and can write, now and then, such charming bits of pathos,—witness the little tale "Rab and his Friends,"—that we are doubly provoked at his iterations, and his inability, when he has said a good thing, to let well alone.

Of good things, these *Horæ Subsecivæ* contain many; and whenever the author can fairly get rid of his love for quotations, they come more thickly than in ninety-nine out of every hundred books we meet with. At p. 189, vol. i., he calls the instinct of philosophy "the true *venatic* sense of objective truth;" and in another place he says that Sedgwick happily "took the wind out of what was tympanitic" in the *Vestiges of Creation*.

One of Dr. Brown's most amusing papers is his sketch of Dr. Chalmers. The portrait is not merely lively and full of characteristics, but is instructive, as showing what is the *kind* of men who win a great practical influence in their generation. Here we have a bucolic audience to the life. "The kirk was as full as it could hold. How different from a brisk town congregation! There was a fine leisureliness and vague stare; all the dignity and vacancy of animals; eyebrows raised and mouths open, as is the habit with those who speak little and look much, and at far-off objects." We know few things better, as a scene, than this.

In discussing the kind of education most desirable for members of the medical profession, Dr. Brown strenuously maintains that a confined study of purely medical science, however extensive and profound in itself, produces far inferior men, as practical healers of disease, than that professional teaching which is based on a general liberal education. His ground is precisely that of all others who take the same view of the effects of liberal studies, viz. that no substitute can be found which will equally sharpen and deepen the powers of the mind. Knowledge of any one science, medical or other, however exact and extensive, fails to impart the requisite culture to the *man*. Above all, he says, cultivate the man, in his intellectual completeness and his active strength. "Pray, Mr. Opie, may I ask what you mix your colours with?" said a brisk *dilettante* student to that forcible portrait-painter. "With brains, sir," was Opie's gruff reply; and, as Dr. Brown holds, it was the right one.

The Life of Edward Forbes. By Dr. George Wilson and A. Geikie. Edward Forbes was an excellent type of the higher class of those naturalists whose position in the "cosmos" of European thought is daily becoming more prominent and influential. To minds which have none of the genuine "naturalist" feeling, it is difficult to imagine men of energetic intellect and elevated moral aspirations devoting themselves to the study of animalcules, or toadstools or sea-anemones, with all the ardour of a metaphysician or a theologian. That research into small marine monsters should

be the object of a voyage to the Isles of Greece, would seem a token of something like fatuity to those who know nothing of the charms of science. And, no doubt, it may appear hardly worthy of the divine spark within us to devote days and nights to what we call the lower orders of creation, if the study ends in itself, or in a mere catalogue of the peculiarities of species, or the grouping of genera.

Forbes was not of this class of mere observers. His biographers justly call his mind Platonic in its character. His habit was to discern in the natural world a representation of the eternal types, which, according to the Platonic philosophy, have existed, and do exist, in the Divine Author of Creation. Though, as in the case of most men of science, he took little interest in the theological questions of the day, this cast of his mind was clear and undoubted, and entitles him to a place among the philosophical class of scientific naturalists.

The history of his struggles to make a livelihood from the cultivation of natural history, so soon as family resources failed, is full of interest, both as a picture of life and from the unaffected simplicity and heartiness of his character. He is also remarkable as having made two false starts in life,—first, as a painter, and then as a doctor,—and finally succeeding as a Professor of Natural Science. He has been unfortunate in his biographer. Dr. Wilson, to whom the larger portion of this thick volume is due, is fearfully tedious and expository, not to call him a book-maker. The book is at least four times as big as it ought to have been, and if its author had lived to complete it, might have been bigger still. Dr. Wilson had a taste for “powerful” writing ; and though his materials for the actual life are scanty, he has contrived to produce paragraph after paragraph from fragments of accounts of the spending of shillings and half-crowns, and can build a theory on a couple of words.

Such of our readers as have read, or tried to read, Mr. G. A. Sala's Papers on Hogarth in the *Cornhill Magazine*, will have formed a tolerably clear though faint idea of Mr. Walter Thornbury's *Life of J. M. W. Turner*. The greatest of landscape-painters is here presented to us in the smartest possible magazine style of the year 1861. Mr. Thornbury is an adept in all that elaborate windiness which is in so much favour with the professional *littérateur* of the day. What with his sham enthusiasm, sham knowledge, and sham contempt for the “vulgar” vanities of rank and wealth, he may pass for a type of the race of bookmakers who have taken the place of the bookseller's hack of a past generation.

The plan which Mr. Thornbury has adopted is to print every scrap of information he could get together respecting the subject of his memoir, with every body's remarks in connexion with him, frequently appropriating whole passages of previous writers ; with these he intersperses all the astonishing rubbish which Turner perpetrated and called poetry, every trivial note or letter that he

wrote, and which Mr. Thornbury has been able to secure; and, finally he mixes the whole up with what doctors call a "free exhibition" of an omnigenous hodge-podge of criticisms, raptures, quotations, dates, names, and places, and pointless anecdotes bearing little more relation to Turner than Monmouth does to Macedon.

We go back to Mr. Thornbury's pages, and turn them over in order to find samples of his style and system. Page 48 opens by chance, and we read the following, apropos to an architect's proposal to take the boy Turner without a premium: "Oily Mr. Porden! without a premium indeed! . . . Go to! You are, I fear, an oily Pecksniff, trying to cheat a man, and all the time professing a deceitful kindness with a lying smile!" A few lines on we are treated to an advertisement, from the *Builder* or *Building News* of 1861, addressed, To Architects. A little further a whole chapter is given up to the skeleton biographies of the painters who were contemporaries of Turner in his early days. Later still, a four-page list is given of the births and deaths of his fellow-painters in after-life, merging in a chronological table of the important events of English and European history from 1782 to 1840; and these are but few out of many such specimens of Mr. Thornbury's proficiency in the art of penny-a-lining. As for the fragments of letters and diaries which Mr. Thornbury has thought worthy of preservation, they are for the most part as important illustrations of character as the last note which the present writer sent to his tailor, or a catalogue of the contents of his wardrobe.

With all this, we must do Mr. Thornbury the justice to say, that he has given a portrait of the strange man and wonderful painter which is probably very near the truth, and is not wanting either in force or detail. The mind of the man who is without a rival in presenting the glories of the creation in all their extremest beauty, was a congeries of the base, the tender, the generous, the miserly, the dishonest, and the sensual. The latter portion of his nature Mr. Thornbury discreetly veils; but it is sufficiently prominent nevertheless. The stories Mr. Thornbury tells of Turner's eccentricities, his readiness in his wit, and his rude yet not ill-natured bluntness, are many of them new to the general reader. His acts of occasional munificence are less known still. And least of all were we prepared to find the painter of the "*Liber Studiorum*" positively altering with his own hand the lettering of the plates of his pictures, so as to pass off impressions from the worn-out metal as early copies. The whole life is a melancholy history; and few things we know are more characteristic of the difference between a man and his works than the fact, that the painter of the "*Old Téméraire*" is handed down to posterity (in Baily's statue) with a countenance suggestive of an idealised satyr in a coat and double-breasted waistcoat.

Travels and Adventures of Joseph Wolff. (London: Saunders and Otley.) We took up Dr. Wolff's two bulky volumes with the expectation of being entertained; and through a good portion

of the book we were not disappointed. He tells agreeably enough the story of his birth, parentage, and education; his hereditary Judaism, and his adopted Christianity; including a truly *naïf* account of the exquisite dogmatism and self-reliance with which he practised his theological eclecticism from his boyhood upwards. "Wolff"—as he ever calls himself—is both the Boswell and the Johnson of his autobiography; a very small Johnson, and an exaggerated Boswell. None but a Jewish Boswell could, with such vanity, parade his own abundant lack of modesty; for Boswellism, sporadic among us, is endemic in the Hebrew race. Of all the precepts of the son of Sirach, none sinks deeper into the mind of a Jew than the one that tells him that it is more foolish to hide his wisdom than it is wise to conceal his folly. Wolff also is as good an instance of the intellectual as he is of the ethical character of his people. He has in perfection that sensuous, visual mind, transforming ear into eye, which only catches form and colour, never the inward essence of a thing; which can paint passion and personify feelings, but can never analyse a conception. This Jewish colouring gives his book quite a biblical hue; it is essentially Hebrew in the materialism of its metaphor, and in its abrupt generalisation of accidental details. A Jew may naturally address his "suffetes" as "Ye who ride on white asses," and an English humorist might jocularly address the bench of judges as "Ye who wear wigs and ermine:" but what Western would ever make a point of a man's moral character out of Father Hofbauer's habit, who "always knitted his own stockings, sitting on a sofa of black leather"? Every thing that Wolff sees in a man seems equally personal to him; there is no distinction of substance and accident; there is no perspective. He "sees men as trees walking"—he looks for bark and leaves where others look for meaning. His realism is perfectly truthful; he does not make himself out, as a hero and a convert from Popery might be tempted to do, to be a martyr to Papal tyranny at Rome, where he gradually found himself more and more out of his element; on the contrary, he makes it abundantly clear that his departure was a relief to the authorities. Evidently it hardly occurs to him to use the vulgar controversial expedient of blackening his enemies, in order to bring out his own brightness by the force of contrast. "Wolff" is a being so far removed from the common fallible herd, and his powers are so truly of the heroic type, that he can well afford to record an occasional error, and disdains to calumniate a foe. He often speaks so enthusiastically of Catholic doctrines and practices, as to warrant the suspicion that he judges them best in themselves, and, perhaps, almost necessary for Gentiles; while for him, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, a chosen scion of the tribe of Levi, it is enough to bear the Christian name, while he leaves himself free to pitch his tent within the borders of any Christian sect, attached to none, but belonging to all, because, as an inheritor of the promises, he is in some way superior to all, a "chartered libertine" of the kingdom of heaven.

After his early history, and his first proceedings in England, he becomes comparatively dull and prosy. His Oriental journeys exhibit him as an adventurous traveller rather than a missionary; a forerunner of Livingstone, rather than a follower of St. Francis Xavier, whom he wished to imitate. His observations are always interesting; but his personal history becomes a mere recital of his eclecticism, working restlessly among Jews and Gentiles, and producing just the result to be expected,—that is, no result at all.

What country but England would produce, at least in any thing like the same numbers, the class of works of which we have specimens in the three remaining volumes of “Lives” now lying before us, but which, we must confess, we have only skimmed? Who *could* read them throughout save the members of that wide-spread community for which such books are provided? They are “religious biographies,” in the popular sense of the term; Evangelical Saints’ Lives; records of preachings; “spiritual” letters, and “spiritual” diaries,—of the approved type, and serving the purpose of breaking the monotony of the lives of the dullest and most prosaic of our race. The *Life and Letters of John Angell James*, edited by R. W. Dale; the *Memorials of the Rev. Joseph Sortain*, by B. M. Sortain; and the *Memorials of Sergeant William Marjouram, Royal Artillery*, edited by Sergeant William White,—are but a repetition of the same thing which we have met with scores and scores of times before, with only the usual minute variations. They are fair specimens of the Evangelical system of the present day, in its nonconformist embodiment, and freed from the more consistent, but more repulsive, extravagances of its early youth. Mr. James was all his life a great light among the Independents, and especially at Birmingham, where, as we learn from his memoirs, he instigated Achilli’s prosecution of Dr. Newman. He is a favourable sample of modern Dissent; a straightforward, honest, religious, man, his doctrinal system modified by his conscience, and his use of the dissenting and evangelical Shibboleths as moderate as is perhaps possible in a sincere adherent to the party and its principles. His photograph, prefixed to the *Life*, shows a rough, sensible, fierce, and good-natured face, and completely falls in with the rational and candid sketch of his character written by his son, and here printed.

Mr. Sortain was the most accomplished person whom the Methodist body has for a long time produced; and his chapel at Brighton attracted listeners who rarely enter any thing in the shape of a conventicle. He *was* a Dissenter, and that was all; for his affections and his tastes were at least as much with the Established Church as with any of her nonconformist enemies.

Sergeant Marjouram was a preaching soldier in the Artillery, who was quartered in New Zealand, and who seems (if his own statements are correct) to have been accounted a good soldier by his officers, and to have been patronised by many of them in his religious labours among his comrades. The book consists chiefly

of his "diary," which is in the approved commonplace style of mild emotionalism, and dull to the last degree.

Dulness may be safely predicated of all books of every kind belonging to the Evangelical party, to such a degree that one might almost doubt whether one peculiar form of intellectual dulness does not lie at the root of the whole Evangelical system, wherever it is found. Its leaders and followers ever have been, with scarcely an exception, men of deficient minds. They are not always stupid, they are seldom exactly silly, they are sometimes even clever, and sometimes tolerably well cultivated. They are often energetic and laborious, and they sometimes heartily dislike what they consider cant and religious humbug. Now and then they are even liberal in their views and feelings towards those who are not of their persuasion.

Their characteristic is a total want of the poetical, the philosophical, and the artistic faculty. To them three-fourths of the universe are without meaning. Man was created to preach, to be preached to, and to be preached at; this is their theory of the final cause of humanity. Now and then, one of the school can understand a joke; but it is their view that the devil made laughter; before he invented quadrilles, whist, and the Opera. If any of our readers are inclined to think that we are over-stating the case, we ask them to take every possible opportunity of reading the writings of the school; and we are convinced that they will agree with us that, whatever its faults and variations, a peculiar, hard, dry, unimaginative—in a word, *dull*—element pervades it throughout, and goes far to account for its special character. In fact, take first the pagan notion of the Divine Nature, with the Lutheran theory of justification which thence results, add thereto an inability to comprehend any thing that is not found printed in the English language, with a certain pig-headed sincerity and self-willed religiosity, and an irrepressible desire for some inward emotion to make up for the loss of other joys, and you have as a result the Luthero-Calvinistic theory toned down to the English standard of the nineteenth century.

Great Expectations. By Charles Dickens. If we were asked to name the walk in which English literature has in late years most distinguished itself by the side of the literatures of other European countries, we should be disposed to give the palm to our novelists. Not that their works form the most important body of books in positive value; but, in comparison with what is done in other countries, they have carried their peculiar matter to a pitch of excellence unknown elsewhere. In this excellence we must give a very high place to the moral respectability that characterises all our great novelists since Bulwer's reformation, with only so few exceptions—perhaps Currer Bell, and perhaps Kingsley—that they serve rather as a foil to the rest. But this respectability was not in fashion when "Boz" began to write; then, the corrupt Bulwer was in the ascendant, and the author of *Pickwick*, to his immense credit,

resisted and overcame the evil influence, and won the foremost place in popularity, without pandering for a moment to the prevailing taste for indecency. The thorough youthfulness, fun, and animal spirits of *Pickwick* will always make it the characteristic work of the author; but it is not so decidedly his best book as to deserve to be always referred to as such. Nancy refusing to be delivered from Sikes, when her love for the child had brought her a chance of redemption, and Charley Bates turning against the murderer, are in a higher style than any thing in *Pickwick*.

But both the fun of *Pickwick* and the genuine pathos of *Oliver Twist* soon degenerated into a tedious reiteration of some superficial absurdity that does duty for humour, and into the pathos of a melodrama at a minor theatre. We trace this fall partly to Mr. Dickens's views about religion; he reminds us of certain Germans of the last century, of whom we may take Herder as the type: they saw no divine element in Christianity, but they made humanity their God, and so made their religion simply human, and taught that man was perfectible, but childhood perfect. So they used to die full of benevolence for all men, and of admiration for the sun, the moon, their children, their dog, and their home. They hated intolerance, exclusiveness, and any positive religion. With a comprehensive charity they embraced all mankind, and branded with the same condemnation both the mutual excommunication of different faiths and the distinction of ranks, as treasons against the broad human nature that was common to all alike. They professed a kind of natural religion, adorned with poetry and enthusiasm, quite superior to the narrowness and lowness of Christianity.

Mr. Dickens is very like these men. Nothing can be more indefinite or more human than his religion. He loves his neighbour for his neighbour's sake, and knows nothing of sin when it is not crime. Thus one whole lobe of the human soul is dark to him; he cannot see a whole character, or perhaps has disabled himself from seeing it by his persevering purpose to write up his own particular views. This partly explains his defects of humour—his giving us so few characters and so many caricatures. And these caricatures have been the winding-sheet and the leaden coffin of his humour. For what fun can any one person find in describing a man by an ever-recurring absurdity, by his ever sucking his thumb, by his having a mouth like a letter-box, or by his firing a gun at sundown? It is the mere poverty of an imagination self-restrained to one narrow field of human nature, that makes him search curiously for such follies, and ransack newspapers for incidents to put into his books. A novelist of a more creative genius describes not a particular individual, but a general character, summed up in one, but fitting many, like Major Pendennis.

It is the determination to make every thing subservient to this fetishism of sentimental civilisation that spoils not only the humour of Mr. Dickens, but the temper of his intelligent readers. They do not choose to be insulted with the negative sermons of

those pathetic death-beds which are made so much happier by the want of all spiritual assistance, and where the "babbling of green fields" is the all-sufficient substitute for the sterner truths of which dying Christians naturally think.

Yet, with all his faults, we should be puzzled to name Mr. Dickens's equal in the perception of the purely farcical, ludicrous, and preposterously funny, though not so much now, perhaps, as in the days when he had not adopted the stage-trick of putting some queer saying into his characters' mouths, and making them utter it on every possible occasion. It is by a partial flickering up of this bright gift that *Great Expectations* has proved an agreeable surprise to so many of his readers. The story is as exaggerated and impossible as any he ever perpetrated ; it is uncomfortable, too, and abounds with those tedious repetitions to which he has become so grievously addicted. Mr. Jaggers is always biting his forefinger ; Provis begins his speeches with a stereotyped phrase. But there is some very good fun in the story, nevertheless ; not jovial, not hearty, not Pickwickian indeed, but really comic, and sufficient to excite a pleasant quiet laugh on a dull winter-day. Wemmick, the lawyer's clerk, who lives in a cockney castle at Walworth, and fires off his gun at sundown every night, is a conception, barring the last characteristic, worthy of Dickens's happiest days. The walk to the wedding is delicious. And, on the whole, then, we may rejoice that even in Mr. Dickens's ashes still live his wonted fires. Perhaps, if he would but lie fallow for a year or two, and let his thoughts range at will, and eschew every thing that is tragic, sentimental, or improving, especially in his particular line of improvement, we need not despair of seeing a still more lively reproduction of the delightful absurdities with which he charmed his readers a quarter of a century ago.

Current Events.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

The Piedmontese Ultimatum to the Holy See.

The Governments of France and Italy are contesting with each other the possession of the Holy See on their territory, and that protectorate over it, that *advocatio Ecclesie*, which was the glorious function of the successors of Charlemagne. As the precarious state of the health of Pius IX. was expected to hasten the moment when the toils of Napoleon III. would close upon the conclave, and when a new Pope would be solicited to entrust his throne to the liberal guardianship of the power that has protected Rome against Sardinia, it was time for the ministers of Victor Emmanuel to offer every concession and every security that could make an arrangement possible between the spoilers and their victim. It is so strongly their interest to obtain the surrender of all the papal dominions, that they may be sincere in the terms they propose. The political system adopted at Turin since 1848 having accomplished its work of representing Piedmont as the asylum and the stronghold of Italian freedom, and having given to ministers the power necessary to obtain the fruits of that position, some things may be modified, some points surrendered, in order that the means by which the object has been attained may not prevent its being permanently secured. It is therefore perfectly conceivable that the best of the Italian statesmen may believe that the proposals of Ricasoli are the most favourable and satisfactory arrangement which the Church can expect. Admitting the loss of the temporal power to be final, they are all that can be conceded without totally sacrificing the spirit of the Sardinian laws, or confessing their incompatibility with the freedom of the Church. We may be sure that there are thousands of religious men who earnestly wish that they may ultimately be accepted.

Baron Ricasoli, in his letter to the

Cavaliere Nigra, accompanying his proposals, founds the claim to the possession of Rome on the sovereignty and unity of the nation, and he consistently points to the inability of a Government which recognises those principles to restrain the popular desire for their realisation.

"The logic of national unity, of that sentiment which will henceforth predominate in the breasts of the Italians, does not admit of this unity being broken by the existence in the heart of the kingdom of a heterogeneous and, what is more dangerous, of a hostile State. . . .

"In this state of things, considering the incontestable right of the Italians, as a nation, to possess Rome, and consequently the duty which forces the Italian Government to aim at this result,—in presence of the unanimity of the public opinion, and in order to avoid serious troubles and commotions, which must ever be deplorable, even when they are repressed or prevented,—the Government now makes a last appeal to the uprightness and to the kindness of heart of the Pontiff, for the purpose of bringing about an understanding concerning the basis of the full liberty of the Church on the one hand, the Italian Government renouncing all part in religious matters, and on the other hand concerning the renunciation of the temporal power. . .

"You will also please to impress upon it that the Government of the King, if unhappily this last attempt should not succeed, would find itself placed in a position of great difficulty; and that, notwithstanding its goodwill in endeavouring to lessen the painful consequences which a refusal on the part of the Court of Rome would probably produce both in religious and political matters, it would not be able to prevent the public spirit of the Italians from being roused to a sense of deep emotion."

The terms themselves are proposed in a letter to the Pope, in which the writer says:

"The rights of nationality are imperishable, and the See of St. Peter, in virtue of a Divine promise, is equally so. . .

"If at every progressive step of society the Church were not able to create new forms on which the successive states of social life might be founded, it would not be a universal and eternal institution, but a fleeting and passing establishment. God is essentially immovable; but, nevertheless, He displays an infinite fecundity in the creation of new substances, in the production of new forms.

"Up to the present time, the Church has given brilliant and abundant proofs of this fecundity, by wisely transforming herself in all her points of contact with the secular world at every new evolution of society. Would they who pretend now that she ought to remain immovable dare to affirm that she has never changed in her exterior or relative forms? . . . But when society had arrived at a more advanced stage, when it had exercised and enlightened its reason, the want of the clerical guardianship ceased, and the bond of that guardianship broke: people sought for and adopted the traditions of the civilisation of former ages; and their Pontiff, by associating himself with this work, deserved to give his name to the century in which he lived. . .

"The Christian idea does not admit of the social power ending in the oppression of one individual by another. It is equally opposed to the oppression of one nation by another. Conquest cannot justify the dominion of one nation over another; for might is not right.

"Thus the Italians, by claiming their rights as a nation, and by forming a kingdom with free institutions, have not violated any one principle of religious and civil order. They found no precept in their faith as Christians and Catholics which condemned their work."

There is so much truth in these passages that some may be blinded to the errors they contain. If religion were the only guide in public affairs, it would be difficult to detect the iniquitousness of an enterprise inspired by an ardent patriotism, by indignation at unspeakable wrongs, and by hatred of a foreign absolutism. Viewing these events politically, there

is much to deceive those friends of right and freedom who apply the ordinary criterions of liberalism. It is true that parts of Italy were detestably misgoverned, and that Austria resisted any fundamental alteration in their system. Unquestionably, therefore, it was expedient that those governments should be destroyed, and this required the expulsion of the Austrians. This was what the Italians sought, and failed to accomplish, in 1848. In the new revolution, they have shifted their ground, and strengthened their hands by a new theory. The whole of Italy must act together in order to expel and to keep out the Austrians; but as the imputation of misgovernment applies only to a part, the national idea has taken the place of the political. "One nation has no right to govern another; each nation has a right to the whole of its territory." This theory, by which every State would be subverted, and the web of history unwoven,—by which civilisation would be stripped of its most powerful instrument and of its most illustrious achievements, which arrests the master race of Europe in its mission over the world, and reduces nations, as socialism reduces men, to a level of equality, in which all progress is at an end,—this theory is the argument by which the statesmen of Italy expect to overcome the resistance, or at least the reasoning, of the Pope.

In this connexion, there is a significance in the allusion to the period of Leo X. The theory of nationality is not an abstraction of universal application. The power it exercises consists in its definiteness. Its advocates do not sympathise with all separated or suppressed nationalities. They do not think of reclaiming Alsace from France. They laugh at the German patriotism of Schleswig. There is not a word for the crowd of nations held in subjection by the Magyars, whilst in Poland the national theory does more for Russia, in the form of Pan Slavism, than for the Poles. It is an offspring of the great revolution which overturned feudalism, aristocracy, and inequality; and it is directed against that nationality whose institutions throughout Europe are founded upon them. It is not intended that every nation should recover its independence; but that one

particular nation, which founded all the States of civilised Europe, should lose its influence. Germany, England, and Holland are the countries against which this talisman has power. An aristocracy maintained by primogeniture, corporations enjoying autonomy and immunities, the sovereign power limited by laws which no despot and no assembly are allowed to set aside,—these are the objects of the special animosity of the men whose principles, transferred to international affairs, produce the theory of nationality. They are also the characteristics by which the politics of the Barbarians differed from that which the nations of the West enjoyed under the Roman Empire.

To the ancient imperial polity—to the traditions of the civilisation of former ages—the Italian constitutionalists wish to revert. They have a legislature founded on popular sovereignty; patricians without political influence; a government which is absolute while it has a majority in one chamber, but which wields a military power that enables it to do without a parliament; and a Church which they have deprived of independence. The French constitution of 1791 is the seductive model and ideal of the whole Latin world. According to this system the principle of all sovereignty resides essentially in the nation; no person and no body of persons can exercise any authority which does not expressly emanate from it; the law is the expression of the general will. All authority comes from the people, to be concentrated in the State. No secondary authorities limit, no laws regulate, the action of the supreme will. The powers that rule the State in these arbitrary governments are dangerous to the Church in principle, and inevitably hostile to her in practice; for they are jealous of every influence besides their own, as they reject all authority which does not proceed from the uniform principle on which they rest; and there is no security and no stability in their laws, however favourable their disposition may be. An absolute parliament is less to be relied on than an absolute monarch; because where it has the will to do wrong, it has always the power. “The share of infamy,” says Burke,

“that is likely to fall to the lot of each individual in public acts is small indeed, the operation of opinion being in inverse ratio to the number of those who abuse power. Their own approbation of their own acts has to them the appearance of a public judgment in their favour.”

Whilst the forms of the Piedmontese system are borrowed from France, its spirit is derived from Austria; and it clothes in a popular disguise the enlightened and tyrannical liberalism of Joseph II. The whole ecclesiastical legislation, since the expulsion of the Jesuits, was an imitation of that of Austria before 1848. This was distinctly proclaimed by Cavour; and it is impossible to deny that by this example given to Italy in the Josephine and Leopoldine laws, Austria has deserved the fate which has overtaken her, and has brought it on herself by demoralising the Government and promoting the revolution. It was her mission, among the Powers of Europe, to develop a higher form of political freedom, by which not only various classes, but various nations might live in harmony together, enjoying the most complex and finished description of self-government; and at the same time to educate the Italian, Hungarian, and Slavonic races in the practice of those rights and liberties which are peculiarly Teutonic. That duty, which was the tenure of her dominion, she too long neglected; and the loss to Italian freedom by her expulsion is greater than the loss of power to Austria. Thus it has happened that at the very time when Austria redeemed her great injury to the Church, by conferring ecclesiastical liberty, she was driven out of Tuscany and Lombardy by a Power which adopted her discarded policy; and that in Hungary the very act by which she has restored autonomy, and given a constitution, has been the occasion for the Hungarians to defy her authority, and to reject her freedom, on behalf of laws, in one respect more obsolete, in another more revolutionary, than her own had ever been. In both cases the punishment came after the repentance.

Whatever the personal dispositions of the Italian statesmen towards the Church may be, however strongly their interest may enforce sincerity in their recent overtures, the nature

of the Government deprives them of credit. A people whose sovereign will is law, can have no reverence for the sanctity of engagements. If it is bound by no traditions, it can be bound by no treaties; it can give no security for the fulfilment of its promises; "people will not look forward to posterity, who never look backward to their ancestors." Like France and America, it has all the privileges and advantages of perfidy without the shame, and all the merit of actual sincerity without the scruples of honour or the troublesome necessity of keeping faith. In international transactions there is some security in the power of the other contracting parties. No such security can be found for a settlement affecting the internal government of the country. The Italian people themselves can give no reliable guarantee, and the guarantee of other powers is impossible for an act which is not so much a treaty as a law of the state. Although, therefore, these proposals have evidently been drawn up with the concurrence of the Catholic divines who are in the confidence of the ministers, and although their full execution would be not too high a price for the settlement which is desired, we cannot regard them as any thing but a snare; and if we consider how completely they contradict the Piedmontese policy, how great an anomaly such laws would be in the system, and how bitter and hostile the tone of the ministry has generally been, it is hard to believe that they are honestly proposed.

They are as follows:

"Art. 1. The Sovereign Pontiff will keep the dignity, the inviolability, and all the other prerogatives, of a sovereign, and also the precedence established by custom over the King and the other sovereigns.

"The Cardinals of the Holy Church will keep the title of Prince, and the honours thereunto belonging.

"Art. 2. The Government of his Majesty the King of Italy will place no obstacle in the way of the acts emanating from the Sovereign Pontiff, in virtue of his Divine right as Chief of the Church, and of his canonical right as Patriarch of the West and Primate of Italy.

"Art. 3. The same Government recognises the privilege of the Sove-

reign Pontiff to send his nuncios to the foreign Courts, and engages to protect them so long as they are on the territory of the State.

"Art. 4. The Sovereign Pontiff will have full liberty to communicate with the Bishops and their congregations, and reciprocally, without interference on the part of the Government. He will also convoke, in whatever place and forms he thinks proper, both councils and ecclesiastical synods.

"Art. 5. The Bishops in the dioceses, and the curates in their parishes, will be independent of all control on the part of the Government, in all that concerns the exercise of their ministry.

"Art. 6. They will nevertheless be subject to the common law in case of crimes punishable by the laws of the kingdom.

"Art. 7. His Majesty renounces all right of patronage in ecclesiastical benefices.

"Art. 8. The Italian Government renounces all interference in the nomination of the Bishops.

"Art. 9. The same Government takes the engagement to furnish the Holy See with a fixed and inalienable dotation, the amount of which will be regulated by agreement.

"Art. 10. The Government of his Majesty the King of Italy, in order that all the Catholic powers and nations may take part in the maintenance of the Holy See, will open with those powers suitable negotiations for the purpose of determining the share of each in the dotation mentioned in the preceding article.

"Art. 11. These negotiations will also have for object to obtain the necessary guarantees of what is stated in the preceding articles.

"Art. 12. On these conditions the Sovereign Pontiff and the Government of his Majesty the King of Italy will come to an understanding through the medium of commissioners appointed for that purpose."

This plan has met with little sympathy, and was hardly adverted to by the speakers in the great debate in the Piedmontese Chambers, which closed in the triumph of the ministry. In the course of the debate Ricasoli spoke as follows:

"As to Rome, the question is not only political, but it is the greatest of

modern days. France, as the friend of Italy, and a Catholic power, has for function to assist Italy in this double problem. Violent means must be set aside in a moral question; what was formerly done before councils must now be effected in the face of public opinion. Every intelligent man now well knows that religion would lose nothing by the fall of the temporal power. The formula, 'The Church free in a free State,' which had remained a mere dogma, must be developed and become the basis of an understanding; that basis has been set forth in the articles submitted to the chamber. It is not for negotiations, but for public discussion, that the ministry has destined that project. This plan has been called a long and sterile road; but I do not consider it so: if, however, it be long, there is no other. Before an institution which has endured for sixteen centuries, let us not be so hasty. The State in this project does not renounce any of its prerogatives; the times are ripe for the reciprocal liberty of the Church and of the State. As the minister of a Catholic king, I have spoken the language of a nation of believers; I have not humiliated the State. I could not address myself directly to the Pope; the Emperor, our intermediary, has not declared himself against the project; he has merely said that the Pontiff was too ill-disposed. The documents were sent to Paris by the French minister of Turin himself."

America.

The progress of events during the autumn has confirmed the belief which was created by the disasters of the summer, that it is beyond the power of the Northern States to overwhelm the resistance of the South. At no point have they obtained a decisive vantage. On the 21st of October they met with a bloody repulse at Leesburg, which was followed by the effectual closing of the Potomac by the Confederate batteries. In the west the Federal armies made no progress; and a naval expedition, which sailed October 29th, and forced the entrance of Port Royal on the 8th November, landed 15,000 men without any considerable result. At the same time, military success, even if it had been obtained, would not have been enough

to restore the Union. The possibility of compelling the seceding States to return to their old position under the constitution of 1787, depended on the existence of a Union party in the South. At first, there were many Southerners who disapproved the extreme measures of that faction which had prepared, during a series of years, the separation of the slave States, and who would have accepted terms with the North. The manner in which Mr. Jefferson Davis has neutralised this tendency, and compelled its partisans not only to give up opposition, but to contribute actively to the success of his daring scheme, appears to be a triumph of statesmanlike ability. The position he at once assumed made it impossible for the North to offer such terms as the moderate party in the South would have accepted as a security for their interests. From the first he declared the separation irrevocable; and the success of his arms soon put an end to any Union aspirations that may have been offended by the attack on Fort Sumter. An opposition has had so little foundation, so little encouragement from the policy of the North or from the progress of the war, that it has made no sign. Politicians who were not eager supporters of secession obtained high office; no measures of compulsion were used; the law has not been suspended; enormous sacrifices have been cheerfully made; and not a soldier is required any where but before the enemy.

Mr. Peyton, who left the Southern States in the *Nashville*, on Oct. 26th, describes the state of public feeling in terms which bear the stamp of truth:

"No disaffection exists in North Carolina. . . . The people of North Carolina are united and enthusiastic in their support of the Confederate Government, and are determined under no circumstances to ground their arms till the independence of the Confederacy is acknowledged by our enemy. Before the State seceded, there was in North Carolina, as in every Southern State, and as there will always be in every popular government, a divided public sentiment as to the wisest policy to be pursued for a redress of the grievances suffered at the hands of the Government of the

United States; but the proclamation of Mr. Lincoln, in contravention of all law and authority, called out 75,000 men, ostensibly to 'hold, occupy, and possess' a few forts and an armory at Harper's Ferry,—a force so disproportioned to the object announced,—aroused the whole people to a sense of their danger, and the Act of Secession was passed by a unanimous vote of the Legislature, and was subsequently ratified by a state-convention representing the sovereignty of the people. 'This action occurred in the month of April last; and since that time I have never heard, in my extensive association with the people, a single expression of opinion in opposition, but, on the contrary, a universal sentiment of concurrence in its propriety, justice, and necessity.

"Before I left America, the State had sent to the seat of war in Virginia, fully armed and equipped, 33,000 volunteer troops, infantry and riflemen, and a splendid regiment of cavalry, numbering 1094. There were 6000 troops on the State coast, and camps of instruction established at Raleigh, Ridgeway, and Gareysburg; and the number of volunteers still offering was so great that General Martin, Commander-in-chief of the State forces, under orders of his Excellency the Governor, had issued a proclamation informing the people that no further troops were needed or could be received."

An English traveller bears exactly similar testimony:

"A few words on coercion generally in the Confederate cause. From ample experience I completely deny it. I was in all the States Mr. Johnson mentions, and, so far from there being coercion, I can bear my testimony that there never was a more united people, nor a more fixed determination in any people to achieve their independence. A gentleman of Louisiana said to me, 'The Northerners do not know what they have undertaken; to succeed, it must be a war of extermination, not only of every man, but of every woman and child.' To judge of the unanimity of the feeling in the States Mr. Johnson alludes to, it is only needed to pass through them. Secession flags flying from every house, women and

children cheering and waving flags to the trains passing filled with soldiers, and from every part sending clothes and supplies to their relations and friends in the army. I travelled with one gentleman who had charge of 100 boxes for one regiment from Alabama; and I know myself that all the railway-dépôts were encumbered with similar contributions, and these not so much luxuries, but real home-made necessities, such as knitted goods, home-spun clothes; in which patriotic work most of the Southern women are now occupied.

"I cannot give a better proof of the absence of coercion, and a more forcible instance of the confidence of the people in the Government, than the fact that the Confederate notes are taken at par throughout the whole Confederacy. Let Mr. Johnson contrast this with the fact of the Washington Bank having refused the Northern Treasury notes, and the report that on this account they are to be suspended as a disloyal establishment.

"While in the Northern States the Government have suspended the *Habeas Corpus*, suppressed trial by jury, interfered with the liberty of the press, and imprisoned extensively both men and women for political offences, even on suspicion, the Southern Government have maintained both the *Habeas Corpus* and trial by jury. . . . It is impossible to travel in their States without recognising the admirable law and government that they have maintained since their separation, or to entirely withhold sympathy from a people who, cut off, or nearly so, from all foreign resources, with naught but their own energies and will, have hitherto successfully maintained a defence of the independence they are determined to achieve.

"With these feelings, I deeply deplore the continuance of this contest, so pregnant with disasters to the combatants, so fruitful of loss and misfortune to the world entire. It is unfortunately now continued by the North under an erroneous idea that there is a strong Union feeling still existing in the Southern States. Alas, the wish with them is father to the thought, which has otherwise no basis. It only needs to go there to find out that Union feeling has ceased

to exist, and has been replaced by a bitterness of hatred that I could not have credited had I not personally become convinced of it.

"There is another equally fallacious aid that the North have counted on, namely, disaffection, not to say worse, among the slave population,—the facts being, on the contrary, that they never were in a more peaceful condition. Instead of an element of weakness in the Southern cause, it is proved to be one of strength, as the whole tillings and culture of the country go on uninterrupted by the drain of the white population to the scene of war. In the South their limit is, not as to men in the army, but in number of arms to equip them. . . . One of their Government said to me, 'We shall look to England to be our workshop and our carriers; it is not our interest to be either a manufacturing or a naval power. We therefore are surprised, in these days of independence of nationalities, that you do not give us encouragement to accomplish ours, by which you will so largely profit.'"

The landing of the expedition near Beaufort in South Carolina, and the occupation of the barren coast of Cape Hatteras, failed to awaken any Northern sympathies. Before the end of November a very sensible person in New York had arrived at this conclusion:

"I think that the movement will cost a great deal more than it will come to, and that it will eventually be a failure. We are already able to judge that the North will not find any Union element in that region, and to foresee that the effect of the expedition will be to increase and exasperate the disunion element. It seems to me that the North will also be disappointed as to deriving any strength or assistance from the Negroes in that region, except, perhaps, from the use of a few hundred labourers; and I think that the Negro element will, on the contrary, become an intolerable burden and impediment to the North if the Negroes should come in in large numbers. They must be fed and governed, and I have no faith in feeding and governing them without the establishment of slavery. We are likely enough to see the truth of this maxim — if the North abolish

slavery, the North will again establish it. I regard the invasion of the South as a military error."

The Washington Government has discovered at last the futility of hopes based on the existence of these sympathies, and the hopelessness, therefore, of a contest in which they have neither political nor military prospects of success. This conviction obliges them to look elsewhere for the means of coming with advantage, or at least with honour, out of the war; and here two courses have suggested themselves, which have divided the Unionists as decidedly as the Separatists are united.

The Republican party is composed of two elements very nearly allied,—the party of "manifest destiny," which desires the exclusion of England from the continent, and the Abolitionists. Their point of union is the theory that the central power, as the organ of the popular will, enjoys unlimited authority. They are the consistent Democrats, because they tolerate no barriers to the sovereign power, and insist upon the unfettered freedom of the people represented in the unfettered power of its Government. A divided rule, intermediate authorities, moral unties, corporations, local powers, joint rights, and the protection of minorities, are things abhorrent to this system. It makes the central power absolute over the several States, and over the rights of individuals, and originates all those vexatious and inquisitive measures which are so repugnant to our notions of self-government and freedom. It is obvious, therefore, why the only European power that has adopted the cause of the North is Russia, why the Democratic party are its friends in England, and why it relies on the sympathy of France.

In these things, which are the elementary principles of Governments, the South offers the strongest contrast. Its central Government is much stronger than that of the old Union, for the very reason that it is not absolute. Its powers are definite and limited; but within its limits it is independent of popular caprice. The rights of the several States and the various classes and interests are beyond the control of the Confederate Government; but it is

not the toy or the engine of the collective will of the people. The President is elected for a longer term, and instead of being a nonentity and the creature of a party or the victim of a compromise, the ablest and most determined public man was chosen, and he visibly governs his country with a strong will. This higher and freer organisation of the South is not the merit of its leaders, but the result of the circumstances of the community. The boundary of the Southern Confederacy is accurately drawn along the limits of slavery and freedom, not because the preservation of slavery is at stake, but because slavery produces that form of society in which the State must be constructed on the political principles of Montgomery, not on those of Washington. Slavery is opposed to Democracy; first, because it establishes inequality among men, and secondly, because it accustoms men to rule other men who cannot govern themselves. That tyranny is the consequence is a general truth; but in the present conflict slavery has exhibited only its beneficial influence on public affairs. The gradations in the population—slave-owners, mean whites, and slaves—at once resolves society into aristocracy.

In spite, therefore, of slavery, there is a natural affinity between the Southern Confederacy and England; whilst the absolute Democracy of the North is hostile to both by nature, and by its twofold tendency towards annexing the English possessions and emancipating the blacks. Yet these two principles, in one respect, contradict each other. Antagonism to slavery ought to be a bond of union with this country, not merely with a particular section. Accordingly, it is on this point that the Republicans have split. One party, led in the Senate by Charles Sumner, who, beyond any American statesman, enjoys the friendship of English public men, insists on the principle of abolition, ostensibly the cause of the war, and assuredly the strongest hold on European sympathy. Another, represented by the Secretary of State, desires not to go to extremities against the South, but to put in the foreground the cause of the liberty and glory of America. This division, extending to the administration, and distracting a President

unequal to so arduous a situation, has paralysed the Government, and diverted the public feeling from the general cause by the excitement of new passions. It is clearly described in a speech delivered by Mr. Sumner, at New York, in which he said:

"You have the consciousness of a good cause, which in itself is an army. And yet thus far, until within a few days, the advantage has not been on our side. The explanation is easy. The rebels are combating at home on their own soil, strengthened and maddened by slavery, which is to them an ally and a fanaticism. More thoroughly aroused than ourselves—more terribly in earnest, with every sinew strained to the utmost—they freely use all the resources that God and nature put into their hands, raising against us not only the whole white population, but enlisting the war-whoop of the Indians, cruising upon the sea in pirate ships to despoil our commerce, and at one swoop confiscating our property to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars, while all this time their 4,000,000 slaves, undisturbed at home, are freely contributing by their labour to sustain the war, which without them must soon expire. It remains for us to encounter the rebellion calmly and surely by a force superior to its own. But to this end something more will be needed than men or money. Our battalions must be reinforced by ideas, and we must strike directly at the origin and mainspring of the rebellion. I do not say now in what way or to what extent, but simply that we must strike. It may be by the system of a Massachusetts general—Butler; it may be by that of Fremont; or it may be by the grander system of John Quincy Adams. Reason and sentiment both concur in this policy, which is only according to the most common principles of human conduct. In no way can we do so much at so little cost. To the enemy such a blow will be a terror, to good men it will be an encouragement, and to foreign nations watching this contest it will be an earnest of something beyond a mere carnival of battle. There has been the cry, 'On to Richmond,' and still another worse cry, 'On to England.' Better than either is the cry, 'On to freedom.' Let this be heard

in the voices of your soldiers; ay, let it resound in the purposes of the Government, and victory must be ours. By this sign conquer. It is with no little happiness that I now announce that this cry is at last adopted by the Government. You will find it in the instructions from the Secretary of War, dated War Department, October 14th, 1861, and addressed to the general commanding the forces which have just effected a successful landing in South Carolina. Here are the important words: 'You will, however, in general avail yourself of the services of any persons, whether fugitives from labour or not, who may offer themselves to the National Government; you will employ such persons in such services as they may be fitted for, either as ordinary *employés*, or, if special circumstances seem to require it, in any other capacity, with such organisation, in squads, companies, or otherwise, as you deem most beneficial to the service. This, however, is not to mean a general arming of them for military service. You will assure all loyal masters that Congress will provide just compensation to them for the loss of the services of the persons so employed.' These words have not the positive form of a proclamation; but analyse them, and you will find them full of meaning. First, martial law is hereby declared; for the powers committed to the discretion of the general are derived from that law and not from the late Confiscation Act of Congress. Secondly, fugitive slaves are not to be surrendered. Thirdly, all coming within the camp are to be treated as free-men. Fourthly, they may be employed in such service as they may be fitted for. Fifthly, in squads, companies, or otherwise, with the single limitation that this is not to mean 'a general arming of them for military service.' And, sixthly, compensation, through Congress, is promised to loyal masters, saying nothing of rebel masters. All this is little short of a proclamation of emancipation. . . . As such, I do not err when I call it the most important event of the war—the more important because it is understood to have the deliberate sanction of the President as well as the Secretary of War, and therefore marks the policy of the administration. That

this policy should be first applied to South Carolina is just. As this great rebellion began in this State, so should the great remedy."

The best comment on this oration is afforded by the advice given to the Union by the most ardent of its English supporters.

"We hold . . . that if the Federal Government set itself honestly and resolutely to sustain the integrity of the Union, it must, willingly or unwillingly, and ultimately, if slowly, proclaim a crusade against slavery; calling to its banners the Negroes of every State invaded, and rewarding their alliance with instant, irrevocable freedom. . . . The inaction or ill-success of the Federal forces at nearly all points has evinced something more than incompleteness of preparation. It has betrayed also, the paralysis of divided councils and uncertain purposes. It has shown that the commanders have been afraid to move, because forbidden to employ their natural and most efficient auxiliaries."

General Fremont represented this policy in the field, and the Secretary of War in the Cabinet. The former, as the candidate of the Abolitionists in 1856, had given the chief impulse to the Secession movement, and when he obtained the command of the army of the Mississippi, he issued on his own authority an Abolitionist proclamation, which was disavowed by the President. It was determined to get rid of the inconvenient general, whose position in the west, joined to his popularity in the country, and especially with his own troops, rendered his continuance in command dangerous to a Government which was unwilling to take the irretrievable step of emancipating the Negroes. Various charges of insubordination and military incapacity came to the support of the President in this design. The Secretary of War visited the western army, and the adjutant-general drew up a report on Fremont's conduct, which was published in order to justify his dismissal, which he received on the 2d November, at a time when his outposts were engaged. The excitement among the officers was very great, and a disposition was manifested to support Fremont against the Federal Government. The general put a stop to this proposal; but he

appears to have acted in such a way as not to allay the irritation or to sacrifice any portion of the attachment to his person, which, in case of a crisis between the opposite views of the Republican party, might yet be of service to him. He retired to New York, where he was surrounded by his friends, but deprecated, it is said, any demonstration for the present.

There was, however, nothing to restrain the zeal of his partisans in the west. At St. Louis a testimonial was resolved upon and a circular issued which declares that "the noble champion of a free nation has momentarily fallen a victim to the selfish intrigues of a corrupt clique. A weak Government has torn from the grasp of the heroic Pathfinder his sword, hitherto unsullied. . . . Instead of the sword torn from his grasp, another one must be placed in his hand by the people, to be wielded for the destruction of falsehood and intrigue, and for the reorganisation of a great and free country." No responsible names appear to be attached to this performance; but at a great meeting of Germans at Cincinnati, held twenty-four days after Fremont's recall, the Rev. Mr. Conway used the following strong language:

"I certainly have felt the heavy hand of slavery enough to know that this Government is not strong enough to preserve the Union and African slavery also; and while this administration is now bending itself to that impossible and undesirable work, the people will be in this conflict like Issachar of old, a strong ass crouching between two burdens,—between an imbecile administration on the one hand, and a gigantic rebellion on the other. . . . Now that the standard of liberty has been unfurled by Fremont over the contending parties,—a higher standard than Stars and Stripes or stars and bars,—how wretched and despicable appear the standards raised by the pigmy generals who have gone out warm from the wing of the administration! . . . What think you of Dix, down in Wise's district, proclaiming that his army is under strict orders to guard slavery, even to the treasonable extent of refusing to take into their lines, whether belonging to traitors or 'any other man,' those black corn-producers and earthwork-

builders? . . . If there is any man who does not know it to be a mean, malignant lie to say that fugitive slaves have been spies against us, he should be placed as soon as possible in the Asylum for Idiots at South Bottom. . . . This, then, Americans, is the infamous crawling, sneaking policy which replaces the electric watchword sounded by Fremont for this great nation."

Mr. Conway then proceeded to show that "a military conquest over the South, preserving slavery, would be a subjugation of the North as much as the South. From thenceforth, he declared the nation must leave the peaceful progress of its destiny, to sit and hold the rebellious States,—turning into a military Government, doing nothing but watching the monster, whose soul is slavery, and see that it does not poke its ugly head out again, and coil about the Northern States again."

General Halleck, Fremont's successor, issued an order—which is a triumph for the South—that slaves are not to be admitted into the camp, as it was found that they carried valuable information to their masters.

It is understood, and the belief is confirmed by Mr. Sumner's speech, that the Secretary of War is supported in the Cabinet by two ministers, whilst three side with Mr. Seward. In all absolute governments the several ministers are nominated by the head of the State; they have no other bond of union and no other condition of their continuance in office. In a constitutional government the ministers are necessarily the leaders of the party which has the majority. As they are raised to power by their parliamentary importance, and not by their administrative skill or experience, they stand or fall together, and are jointly answerable for their several acts. The principle of ministerial responsibility renders this necessary, as well as the nature of that which Macaulay defined to be government by speaking. A prime-minister can only bear the burden of the acts of men who are in his confidence. But in absolute governments the sovereign is not protected by the barrier of ministerial responsibility. He himself bears the consequences of the faults of his servants. In monarchies he loses the support of public

opinion, while in America the President is himself liable to impeachment. Washington, Paris, and St. Petersburg exactly correspond in this respect. At Berlin the system is not very different; and at Vienna a law for the responsibility of ministers has been impracticable so long as the ministry did not form a council with its own president. The expedient of making an arch-duke preside is only an artifice to prolong the transition. For just the same reason the liberal party in England derives its ministers naturally from the parliamentary celebrities; and in 1812 the Whigs refused to coalesce with Lord Wellesley and Mr. Canning, in spite of the most advantageous offers, because it was proposed that a part of the administration should be nominated by one party, part by the other, without consultation, and therefore contrary to the principle that the master in Parliament should be master in the Cabinet. On the other hand the Tory party, less sensitive to the strict letter of the theory of self-government, have constantly surpassed their adversaries in administration, by appointing to high offices men of business rather than men of parliamentary ability. In other governments this difference produces still greater contrasts. Instead of a ministry composed of homogeneous materials, the chief members of which came to office inevitably upon the victory of their party, the head of a State not subject to this law is naturally induced to select for his ministers men of the utmost diversity of opinion. In this way he satisfies the various shades of party among those to whom he owes his elevation, or whom he wishes most earnestly to conciliate; and at the same time he preserves his own independence, and escapes the predominant influence of genius, by balancing one party against the other, and presiding over divided councils. Thus Washington's administration, the ablest ever known in America, included Hamilton and Jefferson, statesmen more widely opposed to each other in their political sentiments than any two men now in public life in England; and in the diary of their broils, which (with an indiscretion to which we owe most interesting and suggestive revelations) has been pub-

lished from Jefferson's papers, it is easy to see that the President rejoiced in their hatred of each other, as, next to their ability, the surest support of his declining authority. In the present instance, it appears to be the difference between Mr. Seward and Mr. Cameron that gives Mr. Lincoln his importance; and it is not surprising that he should have incurred the charge of weakness in his reluctance to take part entirely with either.

Simultaneously with the recall of Fremont, McClellan succeeded Scott as Commander-in-chief. He announced, in a letter to the citizens of Philadelphia, that the war cannot be long, but may be desperate. In the same hopeful strain Mr. Cameron spoke at New York, and General Thomas declared: "We now possess an army—and I have surveyed it in every part with a military eye—such as never was marshaled before since the foundation of the world. That army will be found irresistible; and when we move, as move we will, it will pour over that whole Southern country like the sea."

At the time when Fremont's recall was resolved on, Mr. Seward's policy of effecting a diversion from the conflict—in which success seemed impossible, and would be a great embarrassment—was already in the ascendant. Taking advantage of the distracted state of America, the European powers had determined on an intervention in Mexico, where their subjects had been ill-treated, and where anarchy had reached the highest point by the victory of the liberal party, which had the support of the United States. A convention was signed on the 31st October between France, Spain, and England, in which they pledged themselves to seek no acquisition of territory, but only to restore order and obtain reparation. Under these circumstances the invitation to the Government at Washington to take part in the expedition must have been felt as an insult. The ill-feeling against England was increasing all the summer without good reason. The general opinion of the English public was that the South was not justified in seceding, and that the North was wasting men and money in attempting to subdue it. Even this was miscon-

strued. "If," says a respectable American periodical, "English opinion decided that our nationality must henceforth be divided, it seems also to imply that we ought also to divide according to terms dictated by the Seceders."

Of greater importance was the phantom of a Conservative reaction in England. The discomfiture of the English democracy awakened very sanguine expectations among the Tories, which were rebuked by Lord Stanley in a speech which is by far the greatest exhibition of his talents that we have witnessed, but were promulgated with extraordinary imprudence by the greater authority of Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton. The error of this view was to suppose that the separation of the South would diminish the aggressive power of the North, and that the failure of the first of Democracies would play into the hands of Toryism. The last hope has been already dispelled. The weakening of Radicalism in the country was most of all things needed to give to the Liberal party a broad and firm basis. Their dependence for office on the admirers of America and the sycophants of France was the secret of their weakness, and of the hopes of their opponents. That great blot which Mr. Disraeli and his friends were so skilled to hit once removed, the Opposition loses its best opportunity; and it has already tendered its patriotic support to the Government in a spirit very different from that with which it viewed the war against Russia. The aggressiveness of the North has already refuted the belief in its weakness. Mr. Horsman said very justly in his speech at Stroud:

"The separation will give strength to the Northern States. They will start up a new empire. The disasters of the present day having opened their eyes to the unsafe parts of their constitution, they will form a stronger government, when the law will not be the American law, but the old English law; when the few will govern, and the many obey, instead of every man governing and no man obeying."

Much might be urged by Mr. Seward in support of his scheme. The fratricidal war promised no triumphs,

and the spoils of Canada were more inviting. From the commencement, the annexation of that great dependency has been a tradition of American policy; and it was only averted by that enlightened measure which inaugurated in our Colonies the policy of Catholic Emancipation. Whilst no other State could be admitted into the Union without the consent of most of the others, a place for Canada was expressly reserved. It was never so desirable as now, when the South is gone; never so feasible as now, when there is an army on foot such as no purpose but the preservation of the Union could ever have collected. The Southern war supplies the means of conquest, and the conquest would be the means of retrieving the loss of the South. During the winter months Canada would be all but inaccessible from England; and ever since the visit of Prince Napoleon it was known that the North found strong sympathies at Paris, and that a war between England and America would be the best possible opportunity for the execution of the ambitious designs of the Emperor of the French.

About the beginning of September two English subjects were arrested on suspicion of treachery, but were soon after released. Mr. Seward then issued a circular, desiring the Governments of the frontier States to provide fortifications against any emergency that might arise. The governors did not act upon his order.

On October 14th Lord Lyons wrote to Mr. Seward, complaining of the arrest. The despatch, written on orders from home, and both inadequate and untimely, contained the following passage:

"So far as appears to her Majesty's Government, the Secretary of State of the United States exercises, upon the reports of spies and informers, the power of depriving British subjects of their liberty, of retaining them in prison, or liberating them, by his own will and pleasure.

"Her Majesty's Government cannot but regard this despotic and arbitrary power as inconsistent with the Constitution of the United States, as at variance with the treaties of amity subsisting between the two nations, and as tending to prevent the resort of British subjects to the United

States for purposes of trade and industry.

"Her Majesty's Government have therefore felt bound to instruct me to remonstrate against such irregular proceedings, and to say that, in their opinion, the authority of Congress is necessary in order to justify the arbitrary arrest and imprisonment of British subjects."

In the course of his reply Mr. Seward said:

"The British Government have candidly conceded, in the remonstrance before me, that even in this country, so remarkable for so long an enjoyment by its people of the highest immunities of personal freedom, war, and especially civil war, cannot be conducted exclusively in the forms, and with the dilatory remedies, provided by municipal laws, which are adequate to the preservation of public order in a time of peace. Treason always operates, if possible, by surprise; and prudence and humanity therefore equally require that violence concocted in secret shall be prevented, if practicable, by unusual and vigorous precaution. I am fully aware of the inconveniences which result from the practice of such precaution, embarrassing communities in social life, and affecting, perhaps, trade and intercourse with foreign nations. But the American people, after having tried in every way to avert civil war, have accepted it at last as a stern necessity. The chief interest, while it lasts, is not the enjoyments of society or the profits of trade, but the saving of the national life. That life saved, all the other blessings which attend it will speedily return, with greater assurance of continuance than ever before. The safety of the whole people has become, in the present emergency, the supreme law; and so long as the danger shall exist, all classes of society equally—the denizen and the citizen—cheerfully acquiesce in the measures which that law prescribes."

This unquestioned diplomatic victory strengthened the hands of the American Government, and increased its determination. In England the effects of the blockade began to be threatening; the commercial community was growing impatient; the anger of the Americans provoked a natural

indignation; and there was a general sense that the time was come to make up for old humiliations, and to recover the attitude of dignity and self-reliance which has long been wanting in all our dealings with the Americans. The state of public feeling was such, that the first false step on their part was certain to create an agitation among the commercial classes, supported by all the aristocratic and all the patriotic sentiments of the country, which no government could control. The national pride, so often wounded by submission to America, was prepared to resent any insult that by its deliberateness, or by the approbation it received, should show the hatred and defiance of the North, even though there were no breach of international law; and England would have been as eager to avenge her honour as to defend her rights.

On the 27th November the West-India steamer *La Plata* brought the news that the Americans had given an opportunity of doing one or the other. The officers of the United States frigate *San Jacinto* met at Havana two Southern envoys, and ascertained from them that they were waiting to take their passage in the royal mail-steamer *Trent* to St. Thomas. On the 8th November the *Trent* was stopped in the Bahama Channel by the *San Jacinto*, and Messrs. Mason and Slidell, the two envoys, forcibly carried on board the American vessel, to be thrown into prison at Boston. Their despatches had been concealed, and were sought for in vain.

The telegram announcing the seizure caused, as might be expected, the indignation of Liverpool to boil over; on the same day a meeting was held which passed a resolution that it was the duty of Government to assert the dignity of the British flag by demanding reparation. It was urged on the other hand, that there was no proof of an illegal act having been committed, but the sense of insult was allowed for the time to silence the consideration of the law. On further examination of the facts, it was found that nothing could justify the seizure of the commissioners without carrying the vessel to port for judgment; and that if the vessel had been taken into port, the seizure could not have been justified. A foreign journal, conducted by

one of the first of living jurists, states the case in terms which make it needless to cite the views of our public men, and of our best legal authorities, who have spoken on the subject.

"The right of the American man-of-war to search the *Trent* cannot be questioned; nor would it have constituted a breach of international law had any arms or despatches connected with the enemy been seized. The same remark holds good with respect to the capture of officers or soldiers in the service of the Confederate States. But there is not a single clause in the entire code of international law to extend the exercise of the same privilege to the persons of political negotiators. And justly so. If the criterion of contraband must be sought in the injurious character of the article, the negotiators of the one party, it will be easily admitted, cannot be set down as necessarily detrimental to the other. They may be so; but the thing not being a *primâ facie* case, they have never been included in the list of objectionable persons. It is just possible that their object is not connected with the war, or, if so, that it is directly intended for the mediation of another power in favour of peace. Hence the reception of such ambassadors has been always considered the legitimate right of neutrals; and it is only after the hostile character of the State to which they are sent has been fully established, that the protection due to the envoys must be considered to have lapsed. Supposing, for instance, the *Trent* to have been taken to an American port, no American court would have been entitled to condemn the ship as long as England maintained her neutrality. As it is, the breach of right and justice seems to be so flagrant as to compel the English Government to insist upon the most complete satisfaction. On the other hand, we do not believe that in common equity the American Government can refuse to comply with the demand. They will probably find it but just to declare that the captain of the *San Jacinto* acted without instructions, and that the prisoners shall be set at liberty and receive an adequate compensation for the interruption of their journey. Still, even though a rupture may be avoided for the moment, the ill-feeling that has long

existed between England and America will derive fresh nourishment from the occurrence, and perhaps lead to lamentable consequences in the future."

Mr. Bright, speaking at Rochdale on the 4th December, condemned the seizure as both impolitic and bad, and did not defend its legality; and the defence set up by American writers has so completely failed, that the friends of Mr. Seward have declared that the act was done without orders, and would not be approved. It has been shown that during the period of our utmost maritime predominance and presumption, when our claims and our violence repeatedly involved us in war, we never committed an outrage such as that we have now suffered.

Our Government instantly demanded of the Government at Washington the surrender of Messrs. Mason and Slidell; issued proclamations forbidding the export of gunpowder, arms, and materials of war; ordered 12,000 men to Canada; and proceeded to equip the fleet, supported by great willingness on the part of the sailors of the Reserve.

In America, the act of Capt. Wilkes the commander of the *San Jacinto*, was received with great applause. It was believed that in exhibiting so much spirit he had not transgressed the law; and it was expected that England would have no inclination to go to war in a very doubtful cause. Captain Wilkes himself also averred that he had consulted the authorities, and had observed the spirit of international law; and claimed credit for having generously refrained from seizing the ship in which the commissioners sailed. But when he ventured on this legal statement at a public dinner, he was rebuked by a Boston judge. "There are occasions," said Judge Bigelow, "when a man does not want to look into law-books to ask counsel, or consult judges upon his duty. His heart, his instinct, tells him what he ought to do." He went on to say that he had formed no opinion on the legal merits of the case; but that they could not affect the merit of the officer, or deprive him of the approbation of his country. Such being the state of feeling in America, the Government could not have rejected the responsibility of the act without

great danger. When Congress met, they voted thanks to Capt. Wilkes; and the Secretary of the Navy reported as follows:

"The prompt and decisive action of Captain Wilkes on this occasion merited and received the emphatic approval of the Department; and if a too generous forbearance was exhibited by him in not capturing the vessel which had these rebel enemies on board, it may, in view of the special circumstances, and of its patriotic motives, be excused; but it must by no means be permitted to constitute a precedent hereafter for the treatment of any case of similar infraction of neutral obligations by any foreign vessels engaged in commerce or the carrying trade."

Mr. Jefferson Davis addressed the Southern Congress on the 18th November. The following passages give an idea of his tone and position:

"Abundant yields have rewarded the labour of the agriculturist, while the manufacturing industry of the Confederate States was never so prosperous as now. The necessities of the times have called into existence new branches of manufactures, and given a fresh impulse to the activity of those heretofore in operation. The means of the Confederate States for manufacturing the necessities and comforts of life within themselves increase as the conflict continues; and we are gradually becoming independent of the rest of the world for the supply of such military stores and munitions as are indispensable for war. . . . After seven months of war, the enemy have not only failed to extend their occupancy of our soil, but new States and territories have been added to our Confederacy; while, instead of their threatened march of unchecked conquest, they have been driven, at more than one point, to assume the defensive, and upon a fair comparison between the two belligerents as to men, military means, and financial condition, the Confederate States are relatively much stronger now than when the struggle commenced."

"Since your adjournment, the people of Missouri have conducted the war in the face of almost unparalleled difficulties, with a spirit and success alike worthy of themselves and of the great cause in which they are struggling."

Since that time, Kentucky, too, has become the theatre of active hostilities. The Federal forces have not only refused to acknowledge her right to be neutral, and have insisted upon making her a party to the war, but have invaded her for the purpose of attacking the Confederate States. . . . As long as hostilities continue, the Confederate States will exhibit a steadily-increasing capacity to furnish their troops with food, clothing, and arms. If they should be forced to forego many of the luxuries and some of the comforts of life, they will at least have the consolation of knowing that they are thus daily becoming more and more independent of the rest of the world. If, in this process, labour in the Confederate States should be gradually diverted from those great southern staples, which have given life to so much of the commerce of mankind, into other channels, so as to make them rival producers instead of profitable customers, they will not be the only, or even the chief, losers by this change in the direction of their industry."

"Although it is true that the cotton supply from the Southern States could only be totally cut off by the subversion of our social system, yet it is plain that a long continuance of this blockade might, by a diversion of labour and investment of capital in other employments, so diminish the supply as to bring ruin upon all those interests of foreign countries which are dependent on that staple."

Whilst the seizure and imprisonment of his commissioners inspire the Southern President with increased confidence, the Message of Mr. Lincoln, which is dated 3d Dec., makes no mention of them. The following passages are directed against England:

"A nation which endures factious domestic divisions is exposed to disrespect abroad, and one party, if not both, is sure, sooner or later, to invoke foreign intervention. Nations thus tempted to interfere are not always able to resist the counsels of seeming expediency and ungenerous ambition, although measures adopted under such influences seldom fail to be unfortunate and injurious to those adopting them. . . . Since, however, it is apparent that here, as in every other state, foreign dangers necessarily attend domestic

difficulties, I recommend that adequate and ample measures be adopted for maintaining the public defences on every side, while, under this general recommendation, provision for defending our coast-line readily occurs to the mind. I also, in the same connexion, ask the attention of Congress to our great lakes and rivers. It is believed that some fortifications and dépôts of arms and munitions, with harbour and navigation improvements at well-selected points upon these, would be of great importance to the national defence and preservation."

The following proposal, while it shows how great a change has taken place in a country where frequent modification of laws was a leading principle, is also characteristic of democracy in its despotic features:

"I am informed by some, whose opinions I respect, that all the acts of Congress now in force, and of a permanent and general nature, might be revised and rewritten, so as to be embraced in one volume, or at least two volumes of ordinary and convenient size; and I respectfully recommend to Congress to consider the subject, and, if my suggestion be approved, to devise some plan, as to their wisdom shall seem most proper, for the attainment of the end proposed." When he proceeds to say, "We have some general accounts of popular movements in behalf of the Union in North Carolina and Tennessee," it is obvious that he has no real confidence in them. The question at issue is forcibly and truly described as follows:

"It continues to develop that the insurrection is largely, if not exclusively, a war upon the first principle of popular Government—the rights of the people. Conclusive evidence of this is found in the most grave and maturely-considered public documents,

as well as in the general tone of the insurgents. In these documents we find the abridgment of the existing right of suffrage, and the denial to the people of all right to participate in the selection of public officers, except the legislative body, advocated with laboured arguments to prove that large control of the Government in the people is the source of all political evil. Monarchy itself is sometimes hinted at as a possible refuge from the power of the people. In my present position I could scarcely be justified were I to omit raising a warning voice against this approach of returning despotism."

At the same time the Secretary of War gives the military force at 660,000 men, the Secretary of the Navy states that there are 264 vessels, armed with 2557 guns, and manned by 22,000 men; while the Secretary of the Treasury estimates the expenses of the year ending in July 1862 at 109,000,000*l.* sterling: 26,000,000*l.* to be raised by taxes; 40,000,000*l.* already borrowed; and 43,000,000*l.* still to be borrowed.

Since this difference arose, the French press has been ominously favourable to the claims of England, whilst America has received encouragement from Prince Napoleon. A war between the two countries at a time when the success of the democratic party paralyses the Prussian government, when Hungary is kept down by force, and Italy ready to attack Venetia, is the one thing required to open the way to the conquest of the Rhine. The year closes with gloomy prospects for all countries; whilst, at home, the death of the Prince Consort in this time of need combines with the threatening calamities to strengthen the attachment of the nation to the Queen.

THE RAMBLER.

VOL. VI. *New Series.*

MARCH 1862.

PART XVIII.

THE REVISED EDUCATIONAL CODE.

THE action of Government under the Revised Educational Code is confined to a system of contributions in aid of schools originated by private individuals and partly maintained by their subscriptions; so that every school must be under local management before the State will recognise or assist it. The local managers of twelve thousand primary schools form a large and heterogeneous body, where, as in other similar bodies, the average of intelligence will not be high. Except in considerable towns, and often even there, school-managers every where are the clergy, always characterised by conservatism and aversion to change. Conceding, then, for the sake of argument, that Mr. Lowe's celebrated Minute may be sustained by sound reasons, we still believe that it cannot be worked, because school-managers of all creeds reject it. The alternative before Government, if they decline to abandon the Code, is to see schools every where relapsing into the degraded condition from which public aid and supervision have for twenty years been gradually raising them. A universal panic will pervade the ranks of school-managers, and popular education in England will be a ruined cause. With her Majesty's present Ministers this consideration will carry more weight than even with the House of Commons. To them the event will seem more certain, and its consequences more disastrous; and we cannot anticipate that they will attempt to force the New Code upon an unwilling nation.

That the time and cost of the Royal Commission may not be wholly lost, nor the Revised Code, and all the discus-

sions upon it, remain barren and unfruitful, what remains to be done? Is it possible, while retaining the framework of the old system, with which the representatives of schools generally express satisfaction, to remove the flaws detected by the Commission, and to gain the end designed by the Code? A compromise on such a basis appears to us to be feasible.

The main object of the Revised Code is to secure the realisation of the people's wish, that primary schools should, above every thing, communicate a solid education in fundamentals to the children frequenting them; while the principal defects exposed by the Commission are the expensiveness of the old system, and the conceit and elation of some of the schoolmasters trained under it.

The State exerts influence over the teaching in schools mainly through her Majesty's inspectors. These inspectors form a numerous body, and their sagacity or discretion may not always be up to the highest mark. Left much to his own prudence, rarely communicating with his colleagues or visiting the central office, possibly young and inexperienced, perhaps led captive by a favourite pursuit or author, an inspector may easily fail to carry out the intention of the Privy Council, that rudimentary subjects should always receive his first care. He may press grammatical analysis upon children who cannot read, or physical geography upon those who cannot write, or historical theories upon those who cannot spell; and his examinations may thus become a stumbling-block and hindrance to elementary education throughout his district. The system of inspection itself seems to require organisation, in order to render it efficient for the purpose of promoting solid and suitable instruction; and whatever is needed in this direction can easily be accomplished by the Committee of Privy Council, without violent change.

Our first proposal, then, would be, that the Privy Council should take care to have their inspectors' examinations every where so conducted as to test the fundamental attainments of all school-children, and to afford no encouragement whatever to the sacrifice either of lower classes to higher classes, or of primary learning to quasi-accomplishments. Classification of school-children by age is allowed to be impracticable; nor can the examination be individual, in the sense that the inspector shall report separately upon every child, without an intolerable waste of time. Neither of these arrangements is essential to a sound and satisfactory examination.

We would not, however, rely solely upon the inspectors' examinations. The money of the State should lend its great influence. The certificated masters plead that their augmentations of salary have been guaranteed to them during good service. Let them be continued on the same terms. But an elementary schoolmaster, who fails to teach reading, writing, and arithmetic well, cannot be held to render good service. His augmentation in such a case is liable to forfeiture, and *a fortiori* to diminution. To declare it altogether forfeit, would defeat the object of the arrangement, since inspectors, actuated by the common feelings of human nature, would shrink from inflicting a punishment deemed excessive, and, as long as the choice lay between whole payment or total confiscation, would be pretty sure to let the lazy master escape. A part, however, of the augmentation might, without difficulty, be stopped for every default in teaching the three fundamental subjects. The object of the nation cannot be met by the simple alternative of paying all or nothing; and the book-keeping of the Privy Council office can, of course, preserve an accurate record of reductions, which, after all, involve no greater difficulty than the allowance of discount in ordinary commercial transactions. Let every certificated master, then, lose a portion of his allowance, if reading, or writing, or arithmetic, be not well taught in his school; or if the discipline be lax, or the registration neglected. The inspector might be required in his report to answer inquiries of the following character:—How many classes have you examined in reading? Is reading well taught? Do you recommend allowance of master's augmentation on account of reading? And the same for writing and arithmetic. Whenever the inspector declines to report affirmatively, a deduction of one quarter, or other fixed proportion, should be made in the augmentation. So powerful an incentive to teaching the rudiments would surely prove efficacious.

But yet another engine, and perhaps the most powerful of all, should be brought to bear. The methods of the training schools should be so modified as to produce a larger number of sound elementary teachers, and fewer half-educated coxcombs. These institutions, called *training schools*, are treated too much like *cramming schools*. Their success and their grants depend upon an examination, of wide range and doubtful discretion. Their teachers are encouraged, by handsome gratuities, to grasp at the learning of a University professor. Their students' powers are gauged by oratorical displays, which, though termed *lessons*, are essentially *lectures*.

Their religious and moral fruits are measured by the envy and ostentation of competitive class-lists and graduated marks. In some training schools, the sound judgment of the principals, and a healthy tradition among the students, have checked or counteracted the vicious tendency of such arrangements. Their judicious efforts might be largely aided by the Privy Council. The desired changes are neither many nor fundamental. The annual examination should be reduced in range, and limited to questions suitable for elementary teachers. The colleges could carry their students over narrower ground with greater care, and would still save time. The time thus economised in the lecture-room should be spent in the practising school. And here occurs perhaps the most important change we have to urge. The elementary school devoted in every college to the students' practice must be brought into greater prominence. It should in all cases be large and complete, comprising departments of all such kinds as any of the students may be called to teach. For example, the practising school of a female college ought not to contain merely a girls' room : it ought to have also an *infants' school*, where the students might acquire the method of teaching the youngest children ; a *mixed school*, where the discreet management of boys and girls together might be illustrated ; a *night school*, where the peculiar difficulties incident to the instruction of adults might be overcome ; and a *Sunday school*, where Christian doctrine might be attractively taught, a lending library usefully managed, and all the pious practices of a well-ordered parish lovingly encouraged. Into the practising school, so organised, students should be introduced after three months' residence, and thenceforward they should daily spend a portion of their time in one or other department, practically occupied in the duties of instruction, under the vigilant supervision of qualified officers.

It will be necessary that the comparative diligence and success of the students as teachers should be carefully tested and liberally considered in the annual examinations. There are, it is understood, two inspectors wholly employed about the twenty-seven training schools connected with the Established Church ; and they might inspect frequently and closely. By this means also the wide difference, and even contrast, known to exist in the merits of the several colleges might be gradually removed, and all of them raised to the same standard of excellence. Some of the colleges have, by a grievous error of judgment, been built at a distance from populous neighbourhoods, where children for an efficient

practising school cannot possibly be collected. In such cases, the Privy Council might reasonably require, as a condition of future aid, that each college should affiliate to itself in some well-peopled locality, conveniently situated, a large primary school, to which the students might be sent in drafts to gain that practice which is indispensable for the formation of an elementary teacher.

Together with a modification in the course of study and of consequent examination, and with a reorganisation of the practising schools, a regulation might advantageously be introduced, that every student must continue under training for at least two years, or upon leaving at the end of his first year must take service as assistant to an experienced teacher. In a shorter time than two years the training schools cannot mould the character into enduring form, or communicate an aptitude for employing good methods of instruction; and among the fundamental conditions of any successful system of national education, we should place first the sufficient training of teachers. Relying upon her own experience, Miss Nightingale has declared of nurses, that no one is worth the bread she eats—whether Catholic Nun, Lutheran Deaconess, Anglican Sister, or paid nurse—who has not been trained in the practice of an hospital. For teachers the same thing holds good. To teach well, one must, as a rule, be well trained in a perfect practising school.

Even the teachers of rural schools and dull children need training—and if any training, then a complete one; and the continuance of the plan of placing probationary teachers in small schools is immeasurably superior to the suggestion of the Code, that young persons, inexperienced and untrained, should be recognised as competent to fill small situations. Probationers, it is said, have often made extortionate demands; and the liberal allowance of Government has gone, not to assist the managers, but unduly to raise salaries. New rules might guard against this mischief; but the increase in number of trained teachers will surely apply the best, because the natural, remedy.

The adoption of some such means as we have rapidly sketched in outline would secure for the people that sound elementary education which they ask for their children, and at the same time would check the tendency to conceit, now manifested by a few ill-conditioned teachers. The third object of the Code, viz. economy, may also be gained by a moderate reform of the old system. Grants for books and some other trifling matters may be abolished. The capitation grant, if continued, may be restricted to a maximum of 10*l*.

to any one school; and an equal amount of voluntary subscriptions may be made an indispensable condition of every grant. Under such a regulation, the small schools would continue to receive as much aid as formerly, while comparatively little would be wasted on the larger institutions. In the case of pupil-teachers, the Government, instead of paying their whole stipend at the average rate of 15*l.* a-year, might contribute towards it a yearly sum of 10*l.*, leaving the managers free to make their own terms in reference to any further sum demanded. These two modes of economy would yearly save 30,000*l.* in capitation grants, and 60,000*l.* in payment of pupil-teachers; and if yet further reduction were demanded by the House of Commons, then the *value* of the Queen's scholarship might be brought down to 15*l.* for the female, and 20*l.* for the male scholars—the full *number* of the scholarships being still maintained. Such excisions would attack no vital part of the established system. Protecting it from abuse, they would give it fresh vigour and popularity. Primary education would flourish all the more healthfully and heartily for the loss of extravagant subsidies. *Per damna, per cædes, ab ipso ducet opes animumque ferro.*

The Ministerial explanations delivered in Parliament upon the 13th of February improve but very slightly the prospects of the New Code. The temperate and conciliatory speech of the Lord President, indeed, had it stood alone, would, with the modifications introduced by Ministers themselves, have gone far to disarm opposition, and to render probable the success of the Minute. But the Vice-President of the Education Committee, throughout a statement of much ability and more length, seems to have displayed the temper of a desperado, resolved to blow up the ship rather than lower his flag. No sagacious Minister, intending to carry out unpalatable changes through the coöperation of various classes of men, would have chosen such an opportunity to alienate the good will of all his coadjutors. Yet Mr. Lowe, knowing well the delicate position of his Code, recommends its adoption by jeering at educationists, snubbing inspectors, depreciating managers, and insulting schoolmasters. The system he has to work, the department over which he presides, the instruments at command, he vilipends them all. Irritated by the resistance to his own measures, he determines at least to ruin the scheme of another, more astute, because more successful. It is hardly conceivable that he would have thus acted, had not the abandonment of the Code been already decreed by his chiefs. For Lord

Derby and his friends are keenly alive to the popularity to be won by opposition to Mr. Lowe's statesmanship, and Lord Palmerston will never permit so easy a triumph to be snatched by his political enemies. The Code, then, may be accounted a failure.

Meantime the modifications introduced into the revision of the Revised Code, to adopt Mr. Disraeli's phrase, may be recorded. They seem designed to defeat the opposition by breaking it up. Thus, Scotland is still to enjoy the old Minutes. The training colleges, too, remain for the present untouched. Infants under six escape individual examination. Certificated schoolmasters must, as a condition of government grants, receive from their managers a salary equal to three times their augmentation. Sixteen days' attendance in the month preceding examination will not be enforced; and a larger number of children than was at first proposed may be left without a pupil-teacher or assistant to instruct them.

But nothing has been done to remove the grand objections to the Code. Managers are still invited to advance large sums of money from their own purse, on the chance of being reimbursed an indeterminate portion of it; and the government grant still depends (excepting for infants under six) upon individual examination of scholars grouped according to age. But voluntary managers, as we rest convinced, will not or cannot find money for salaries; and this one difficulty will paralyse the Code. Moreover, the separate examination of every primary scholar would consume so much time as to be practically impossible. To take an extreme example: we find among the night-schools receiving government grants one with an attendance of nearly 900 scholars. The school is open four nights in the week for two hours. With allowance for putting away shawls and bonnets, and for opening and closing school with prayers and psalmody, not more than an hour and a half each night could be taken for examination. The calculation is, that the individual examination in reading, writing from dictation, and working sums, will occupy ten minutes per head; and as the inspector must ascertain and record every scholar's name, verify his age, choose and point out a new passage for reading, dictate slowly and correct the dictation, select fresh sums and check the working of them, and record marks in each case, we think that few inspectors will get through their task in so short a time. But, at ten minutes each, an inspector in the night-school in question may in one night examine nine scholars. At the same rate

the 900 scholars will occupy him for 100 nights, or for twenty-five weeks of four nights each. And during this lengthy examination of six months, what will become of the school? And at this rate, how many inspectors will the country require?

Such a scheme is reduced to an absurdity. Its only recommendation is, that the Royal Commissioners report three-fourths of the scholars to leave school unable to read and write usefully. The school-inspectors report differently. Mr. Lowe may be right in believing the Commissioners. The dark side is oftener, perhaps, the true one. But it cannot be denied, that the visitation of the Commission was extremely partial and incomplete. They visited no Catholic schools at all; and if it be urged that Catholics must not (any more than other men) take advantage of their own wrong-doing, then we turn to the most populous county in England, which has received larger education grants than any other county. In Lancashire, the only place visited by the Commissioners was Rochdale, a third-rate town, with characteristics more nearly allied to Yorkshire than Lancashire. If, then, Scotland is exempted from the Code because the Commissioners' inquiry did not extend to that country, why not exempt the Catholic schools also, and all the Lancashire schools, excepting only those of Rochdale? To be sure, a combined phalanx of members may make a political difference in favour of Scotland; but educationally, the parts of England not visited by the Commissioners have equal right to exemption from the New Code.

Mr. Lowe argues that his scheme will be either effective or economical: effective, if through its influence the children all learn to read and write; economical, if they fail to do so, and thus forfeit grants. But it is mere mockery to recommend a system of State aid to education on the ground that under it no aid may be given; and in insisting so pertinaciously upon testing results, the Vice-President has forgotten Cicero's aphorism, familiar to him while at Oxford—*Difficile esse causam laudare puerum: non enim res sed spes est*. In recognising the hope of youth, in accepting perfect machinery with the future prospects, the old plan proceeded not unphilosophically. The New Code tolerates nothing from children of six and upwards but positive results—*rem, quocunque modo rem*—and refuses all assistance to promising attempts. Thus it contravenes the laws of nature, and will remain ineffective; but it deserves the praise of economy no more than the miser's method of treating his horse, which miserably perished just when it had been taught to subsist upon one straw a day.

MORAL LAW AND POLITICAL LEGISLATION.

WHEN M. de Tocqueville had read Prince Albert de Broglie's excellent volumes on the Church and the Empire in the Fourth Century, he wrote to the Prince to propound a great question, which had already often troubled him, but which was brought before him with new force by the work he had just read. How is it, he asked, that the influence of Christianity should be so successful in reforming mankind, and so unsuccessful in reforming society; that it should make men more virtuous, and yet more indifferent to public virtue; that it should regulate the family, and leave the State in all its corruption?

The answers which have been given, explicitly or implicitly, to this question may be reduced to two. One asserts that Christianity has nothing to do with politics, and what is called public virtue; the other asserts that Christianity includes public virtue, and that its political failure is only the failure of public men to carry out its political principles, since, wherever they have been faithfully and earnestly carried out, their success has been complete. Let us examine these two answers in order.

1. It is true that Christianity has no direct power over the State or over public virtue. It cannot make the constitutional coward a brave and warlike patriot, nor the idler of the tropics a laborious producer. All China might be converted, and every man in it sanctified for heaven, and still the empire would not be saved if the materials were wanting for statesmen, generals, and soldiers,—if there were no political sense and commercial energy. Christianity can inspire, regulate, and mould, but it cannot create materials. This is true even in the spiritual order. "The reform of the religious orders," it has been truly said, "is scarcely more in the power of the Church than their foundation. . . . To found a religious order requires men specially raised by God. . . . The Church encourages such men, but does not create them by an authoritative act. And could it be otherwise with reform, which is still more difficult than foundation?" In like manner, but more emphatically, the Church is powerless to erect or to preserve a State where the physical and political conditions are wanting. This is why she could only linger, but could not save, the Roman Empire. None of the fathers expected a long career for Christianity; for they saw that the Roman people had become hopelessly decrepit,

and they thought the barbarians hopelessly savage. The great men of the period shone with the red glare of a sunset; their passions were those of a Tacitus,—anger, weariness, despair, that fruitless retrospection of a dying man which promises nothing for the future, founds nothing for posterity. Such was the nature of her materials, and the Church could not build with them.

But it does not follow from this that the Church has nothing to do with politics and with the State. Christianity has promise “both of the world that now is and of that which is to come.”* Whatever is promised by God is an object which He holds up to our hope and endeavour. To deny the religiousness of this hope and endeavour, is to deny that God made the promise. Yet the declaration of the Apostle is founded on two distinct promises of our Lord; and its practical interpretation during eighteen centuries of combat, especially by the Popes who founded their temporal power, and by the faithful who defend it as a right, proves that Christianity has a double end,—one subordinate and temporal, the regeneration and progress of society; the other supreme and spiritual, the salvation of the individual soul.

Christianity, then, is one, but has two distinct objects, approached by distinct paths. She conducts the individual soul to heaven by personal and subjective morality; and she tries to mould a civil society wherein the principles of positive and objective morality are publicly acknowledged, where the atmosphere of opinion and habit helps men both to know and to do their duty. These two ends are as distinct as are their respective subjects, the mortal man and the immortal soul. Society is only a temporary organisation of fleeting atoms, and has its being in time and for time. The soul is deathless, and looks for its perfection on the other side the grave, in eternity.

It is by its temporal end that Christianity enters into relations with the State. To deny these relations degrades the State, and leaves it only charged with material functions. In reality, the Christian state, on the contrary, carries out the earthly and temporal end of the Church; it is a moral institution, for moral ends, and employs moral as well as physical means. It has its obligations of duty and obedience, its sacrifices in taxation and defence, its criminal jurisdiction, and its punishment of death. Thus what the Christian Church does for the next world, the State does for this; it realises on earth the moral order of heaven: the Church for the soul, the State for society. The Church does not kill the

sinner, but gives him time to repent. The State puts the criminal to death, though he dies impenitent and goes to hell. For the Church looks to the salvation of the soul beyond the grave, the State to the salvation of society on this side the grave. The Church and the State differ, in that, materially, their respective ends are separated by the grave. They are alike, in that they have substantially the same moral end. This community both enables and authorises the Church to become the counsellor and guide of the State.

2. Does, then, the political failure of Christianity, which Tocqueville laments, result from the failure of the State to listen to the counsels of the Church? This is the solution offered in such books as Mr. Digby's *Ages of Faith*. In proportion, he would say, as the principles implied in the beatitudes have been the motives of public action, States have been prosperous and progressive; in proportion as these principles have been neglected, States have sunk into misery and ruin. It is true that, in the history of Christendom, we repeatedly find periods in which the corruption of society was only to be cured by the heroic remedies of Christian asceticism. When, in the fourth century, almost whole populations in the East emigrated from the cities into the desert, and assumed the habit of monks, St. Chrysostom assures us that, if the moral and political state of the cities had been endurable, there would have been no need of leaving them. But social degradation had then reached its lowest depth. Government gave no guarantee for justice, but ground down every citizen with taxation. Riches were worshiped only as means for debauchery; poverty was degraded, and labour was hateful, where it was not impossible through the tax-gatherer's having seized the poor man's plough and oxen for arrears of tithe. All classes despaired. Vice was preferred to marriage, and even the virtuous did not care to become parents of an offspring destined to inherit the curse of the earth's closing years. The race had become sterile and effete. The despotism of the Cæsars had destroyed liberty, and effaced all social organisation; and society was reduced to a mass of unconnected atoms, like a sea of water or a wilderness of sand. Above it was the omnipotent State, with its eye and hand in every thing, claiming soul and body as its own, crushing the beginning of every reform, lest an organisation strong enough to resist the torrent of corruption should come to be able to resist the officers of the State.

This condition of society caused a real emigration from the cities into the desert, on a scale unknown to the modern world, but beheld at intervals by the East and by Europe,

from the fourth century to the fourteenth. And in this emigration were discovered the seeds of the reform which was to regenerate society. The rule of the monks,—poverty, chastity, and obedience,—adopted by them as the exact opposite of the vices which they abhorred, turned out, in its mode of action, to be an instance of spiritual homœopathy, curing like by like, instead of contraries by contraries. The degradation and vices of pauperism were cured by voluntary poverty; the true remedy against the depopulation of the world was found in chastity; and the levelling despotism of the pagan State, and the dishonourable submission of a slavish people, were healed by a rule which allowed absolute authority to the abbot, and prescribed “servile obedience” to the monk.

For the ten centuries during which the monks appeared and predominated in history were a period when social questions had become political; when the controversy was no longer about the details of policy merely, but about the preservation of a people to be the objects of political manipulation. The towns were empty, the race was exhausted, demoralised, and sterile; and if the population could have increased, it must have died of famine, when labour was dishonoured. The poverty of the monks showed that there was something more honourable than wealthy debauchery; it restored honour to labour, teaching thereby a lesson as needful for the destructive barbarians as for the listless Romans; and by the products of its labour palliated the degradation and squalor of the corrupted and despairing citizens. Similarly, the celibacy of the monks did more than the *Lex Julia* and the *Lex Papia Poppæa* of Augustus could do:—it discredited the abominations which were an obstacle to the multiplication of mankind. But monastic obedience was a far more direct cure for political servitude. The Christian emperors had relinquished no part of the rights over both soul and body which the pagan State had usurped, and allowed no centres of authority, whether spiritual or civil, to compete with their claims. But the same causes which drove the monks into the desert also forced them to gather round abbots, and thus gradually ranged them into orderly systems, and set up other centres of unity and authority over against the throne of Cæsar. The monk was equally interested in maintaining the freedom of his corporation from the State, and the authority of his corporation over its own members. Moreover, when he invited others to join his society, he was as much obliged to vindicate their independence of the State in their choice of a vocation as he was

to vindicate his own freedom from every other authority than that of his religious superior. Hence the spiritual corporation was obliged first to secure, and then to make the civil power acknowledge, its independence, and thus to set up a precedent for freedom of corporations in general in the midst of a strongly organised State.

Thus the penitential canon—"sin is purged by the same quality as belongs to its origin; the same quality should be present in the extinguishing cause as is found in the producing cause"—applies to more circumstances than the common publicity, or the reverse, of the sin and of the penance. Our race was taught how to restore its natural increase by men and women devoting themselves to chastity; productive labour was reëstablished in the habits and respect of the people by men vowed to a poverty which gave them no interest in the products of their labour; and a degrading political servitude found its strongest antagonist in an obedience "like that of a corpse without a will of its own," which the canonists virtually call servile, when they say that the monk *servo æquiparetur*.

But these lessons and remedies were not fitted solely for an age of social ruin; they are addressed to all time. For since population flourishes not by absolute increase, but by the harmonious and proportionate increase of numbers and of material resources, true economy consists in discovering and realising the laws of this equilibrium, in preventing the reproductive force both from being exhausted by abuse and from outrunning the means of livelihood. Ecclesiastical celibacy provided a remedy against both the physical and the economical difficulty. It restored, with virtue, the vitality of men, and it anticipated Malthus in prescribing the first "moral check" by which the balance of population and food is restored and preserved. Every one who voluntarily embraces celibacy leaves room for another household to take the place of that which he abstains from evoking from possibility into actual being, and abandons to another the means of obtaining the enjoyment which he denies himself; thus narrowing the area of that internecine struggle for life which must be the lot of all living creatures in a world where the means of life are limited. Thus there is an element of economic beneficence in the vow of chastity which the monk makes for the good of his soul. The same is true of his vow of poverty: he sows that he may reap in the next world; but his neighbours reap in this world the harvest he has sown. The self-denying labour of those who have nothing to gain by the fruits of their toil, except the

merit of the act and the occupation of their faculties, involves the smallest possible investment of capital, the lowest possible wages of labour, and the greatest possible zeal.

The political lesson taught by free corporations is one too important to be briefly treated. Here we need only ask our readers to note how irreconcilable is the freedom of the monastic corporation with modern as well as with ancient despotism. A government that seeks absolute power either abolishes monasteries or deprives them of their liberty, whether by the *commendam*, or by usurping their regulation and treating them as departments of official life.

Poverty, chastity, and obedience are the outward shapes of the ascetic life; but that life has also an inward idea, which is embodied in the moral theology of the confessional. In this view, asceticism is the personal appropriation and exercise of the Christian law. Through it, the universal law becomes personal, the objective rule becomes subjective. In this modification we may note three particulars. (1) Whereas the absolute or objective moral law regards the rule only, the applied or subjective law looks mainly to the intention of the act, to its circumstances, and to the end for which it is done. (2) The absolute law exacts compensation for all wrong; but the applied law admits in many cases internal repentance as a substitute for an equivalent material satisfaction. (3) The absolute law estimates acts and states of life only by their intrinsic lawfulness or unlawfulness; but the applied law estimates them also by the occasions of sin which they are apt to give. The confessor, though he instructs by the principles of objective morals, judges and advises by those of subjective morals; he judges by the intention, he advises by his knowledge of the particular things that are occasions of sin to the particular penitent, and he accepts repentance as replacing innocence. Now each of those subjective particulars has been the occasion of a great reform in the idea of objective morality. The pagan, to whom law came as an externally imposed code, saw in the difference of laws in different countries a proof that all law was arbitrary and conventional. To make law more personal and subjective always threatened to introduce a fresh cause of uncertainty; but in reality law has by this means been brought back to its true origin—the voice of the Creator, speaking through the conscience,—and has thus been once more invested with a character of universality and certainty almost mathematical. In like manner, the variable rule of avoiding occasions of sin would seem most apt to perpetuate the differences and variations of law; but, in reality,

this rule, by making familiar to the people the distinction on which it was founded,—between acts essentially wrong and acts that are only wrong when they are dangerous,—has swept away the superstitious rules of paganism, which, when it acknowledged sin at all, condemned sins against the elemental purity of earth or water, or violence to the sacred beasts, more severely than sin against God or violence to man. And it was necessary that the doctrine of the efficacy of repentance should be well impressed on the people before society could abolish the clannish *vendetta*, or introduce a spirit of humanity into the penal law.

Now these facts, which must suffice as examples of the mode in which Christianity has benefited the world, might lead any one to think that if the same path were followed, every fresh step would carry us higher, and would be a fresh record of the triumph of religion in every department where she was permitted to exert her influence. Yet, on the other hand, all these facts exhibit religion as a remedy. But physic is not food, and homœopathic remedies in particular are those which, when given in large doses to a healthy patient, will produce the same symptoms which, when given in small doses to a sick man, they are said to cure. There is a time in all recoveries when remedies hitherto wholesome become hurtful. Let us follow the hint of this analogy, and see whether the political failure of religion does not result less from failing to apply ascetic principles to social and political life than from an over-anxious application of them.

Such an application of ascetic principles to social and political life may be either tumultuary and popular or scientific and legislative. The first may be expected in periods of great religious excitement, like that of the emigration of cities into the desert in the fourth century, when, in his youthful enthusiasm, St. Chrysostom hoped and prayed to see the polity and life of cities become like those of monasteries in all things save marriage;—or like that of the thirteenth century, when even marriage was looked upon as so perilous that the fathers of the fourth council of Lateran were led to add a clause at the end of their creed, to assert the possibility of salvation not only for those who professed chastity, but for the married likewise. Riches were similarly suspected when the rise of the Franciscans made voluntary poverty almost a contagious passion. In the hopeless anarchy of the 10th and 11th centuries, Christians throughout Spain, France, and Italy feared every earthly joy as dangerous; spurned art and science as toys; turned from the duties of patriots, subjects, and citizens, as belonging to a death-

stricken world ; slighted useful toil as alien to religion ; and set up the outward worship of God as the one business of life, supplanting all other occupations,—crushing and extinguishing them all under the weight of its overwhelming greatness. But when the outward worship of God is thus set up as the great business of all men, political and social ruin and degradation inevitably follow. Worth is measured by a quality which any hypocrite can assume. The processes of the intellect are scorned ; and productive labour is dishonoured, being tolerated at first only as needful to furnish the bare necessities of life, and soon ceasing to furnish these.

The fanaticism which dreams of making an exceptional life the common rule, of imposing the evangelical counsels as precepts upon all, and of transforming the whole world into a cloister, is no more profitable to religion than to politics. Bourdaloue, in one of his admirable sermons, condemns “those restless Christians who seem to seek a state of life more conducive to salvation only through disgust of that state to which their salvation is attached ; who, under show of some feigned good, always want to be something they are not, and never try to become good Christians where they are ; whose good intentions all turn out to be empty resolves that they would live more regularly if they were in states that they cannot be in, and never will be in, all the while forgetting what God is now requiring of them in the state in which they are.” No wonder, then, that the induction of all times should be, that the contagious vehemence of an exclusive ascetic spirit, which holds itself aloof from all the works of life and all the processes of reason, is that which in the long-run most panders to vice, while it shrouds infernal morals with the cloak of celestial professions.

Perhaps it scarcely required so many words to prove the evident truth, that to force the profession of an ascetic life upon all men is not the way to improve either their religiousness or their earthly welfare. But it may be different with the attempt to bring the laws and usages of society into progressive conformity with ascetic principles. The rapidity and completeness of the first victories of asceticism over social degradation, might well fill the most cautious with the hope that what had done so much was destined to do all, and that what had sanctified and saved the man and the family might equally sanctify and save society and the State ; and this hope would naturally lead religious men to try to modify the laws of society by their own principles. Let us see what has been the result of endeavouring to mould the legislation and habits of mankind by the spirit of poverty,

chastity, and obedience, and by the principles of subjective morality,—intention, repentance, and the avoidance of the occasions of sin.

It is clear that, beyond the example of purity, and the regulation of the daily intercourse between the sexes, monastic celibacy could be no rule for secular life. Neither can the poverty of monks and their community of property be any law for the world, except in the dreams of enthusiastic communists. But the monastic theory of labour has filtered into the habits of certain populations. The early monks were the fathers of modern agriculture, the architects of our noblest buildings, the makers of roads and bridges, which the apathy of the first Protestants let go to ruin; they re-domesticated animals which generations of barbarians had suffered to run wild; and rescued from destruction the records of the arts, sciences, and literature of a ruined civilisation. But the grand products of their labour were one thing, and the object for which they performed it was another. They wrought not for the work's sake, but for the workman's. To them labour was a necessary occupation, but production was not an important end: it was indifferent whether they worked with their pen or with their plough, for their work was rather meant to absorb their attention than to exercise their powers. The habits of populations inspired by this spirit cannot maintain them at the level of modern progress, for it keeps them strangers to the economical meaning of "industry." So far as this view of the ascetic code is taken, work becomes merely "occupation,"—something to engage the attention, and to leave no vacancy for evil thoughts. Labour comes to be estimated not by its products, but by the time it consumes innocently and meritoriously. Acts of devotion and charity are held to be the only solid works. The rest is negative: it consists in exercising a perpetual veto upon thoughts that might wander into forbidden ground; in avoiding occasion of sin; in doing nothing wrong; in doing nothing at all, if so a man can keep out of harm's way; at least in looking upon all occupations of hand or brain as mere stop-gaps against the intrusion of temptation,—equally insignificant, except so far as they contribute to this great end; equally indifferent, whatever difference there may be in the material worth of their products. It needs no long reasoning to enforce the lesson of experience, that this system, which strives to supersede all other rules of earthly conduct by the influence of asceticism, nullifies earthly conduct altogether, and makes men triflers who amuse themselves without vivacity, who fall into vice with-

out vigour, and who do every thing with the languid air of those who feel that they have nothing to do, nothing to care for, nothing to seek, but every thing to avoid ; a strange development of the principles of those grand old monks, who were, in strength of character, emphatically *men*.

Obedience is the most meritorious and essential part of the life of the monk, who, by an act of will still free, abdicates his freedom, gives up his legitimate rights into the hands of a superior whom he has freely chosen, and promises prompt, perfect, and absolute obedience ; and the influence of this idea has been even more important politically than socially. Successful at first as a sovereign remedy against the despotism of the Cæsars, it tended, by its continued application to the society which it had regenerated, to reproduce the symptoms which it had formerly removed. After the break-up of the Empire, religion was almost as much inconvenienced by the fragmentary state of the barbaric and feudal world as it had before been by the leaden uniformity of the imperial system. The Church remedied this state of things by borrowing from the Jews the notion of an anointed king, and thus raising up, by a divine sanction, a unitive power, which society could not at the time develop out of itself. And the Christian sovereign, a prince elected once for all by the people, but bound by a coronation oath, and answerable to the Church for its observance, became a counterpart of the Benedictine abbot, elected by his monks as their master, bound by the rule, and answerable to the Pope for its observance. It only required the civil law of imperial Rome to be grafted on the Christian monarchy, to enable the prince to throw off his responsibility to the Church ; and then his oath became a nullity, and his power became a despotism, responsible only to the revolution.

Again, the ascetic idea of obedience derived from the moral code of a theocracy, is obedience to the personal will of the supreme lawgiver and ruler. The political idea is obedience to law. The preponderance of monastic corporations naturally tended to impose the ascetic idea upon civil society ; and, as naturally, reactionary attempts were made to force upon the Church the notion of political obedience to law, instead of obedience to the supreme lawgiver. One of the glosses on the bull of Alexander III. for the truce of God questions whether such a precept is binding before it is received by the usage of the people. The canonists who took the negative side argued on the purely political principle that law is only custom declared or defined, and that without a foundation of custom no law is legitimate or binding. The

canonists and theologians who affirmed the validity of the precept insisted on the supreme power of the Pope to bind and to loose, independently of any "co-legislation" of the people,—that is, on the theocratic and ascetic idea of obedience. Here we have evidence of a contest that would never have arisen if the two spheres had been kept asunder. For political law is local and national, growing up in particular families and races, and suited to their national character, circumstances, and wants. But the law of the universal Church must be regardless of particular conditions, of historical traditions, of physical aptitudes, of ethical inclinations, and of geographical relations. The two kinds of law can only clash when one or the other is arbitrary, exclusive, and aggressive. Each has its own sphere, and the two spheres can only be in harmony when kept distinct. The first principle of political legislation is, that law should grow up out of the habits of the people, should be custom as well as precept, *mos* as well as *jus*, and should thus be the expression of the national character and life. But the first principle of religious legislation is, that the law is imposed from above, theocratically, by the organ of God's government—the Church or her supreme Pontiff.

When legislation takes the ascetic or theocratic form, and imposes upon the people a code alien to their manners, it must lead, not only by its peculiar view of obedience, but by its mechanism, to the absolutism of the State. The new system must be administered by experts, by an army of lawyers and bureaucrats. The people cannot administer a law which is not theirs, which they cannot know because they have not made it. On the other hand, self-government is built not on a code, but upon custom, and its law, the *droit coutumier*, or common law, is learnt, not from general principles and definitions, but from practice and precedent, and is administered by the people themselves, who are their own judges, jury, police, and soldiers, and who manage their local affairs by their own local officers. This kind of legislation is the secret of free growth; for it reconciles liberty, progress, and conservative tradition. Self-government supposes the common interest of all the people to maintain the law; the super-imposed code produces an antagonism between the people and the law. For instance, the subject of an imposed code may reconcile it with his conscience to smuggle, because he is willing to bear the penalty if discovered; but the subject of "common law" is bound by an implied pact with all his fellow-subjects, as co-legislator with them, to observe a law in which all are equally interested, and to which all are mutually obliged.

Again, while political law only legislates for outward acts, the ascetic law legislates for the inward thought. The decree of Innocent III., that all clerks should recite the divine office *studiose et devote*, raised a question whether even ecclesiastical law can do more than regulate external acts, leaving the intention to God. The canonists answered that the Church does, in fact, legislate about the hidden motions of the mind, and punishes in the Inquisition even secret heresy of thought, whenever she can find it out. Secular legislations, claiming to be based on the ascetic principle of a divine sanction belonging to the personal lawgiver, have attempted to transport this right of the Church into their own sphere, and have tormented the subject for disloyal opinions, expressed or suspected; and States which are both secular and ecclesiastical, the existence of which depends on the belief of the people, and where consequently the preservation of the faith is the first political necessity, are led to carry out furthest this inquisitorial process. It becomes a business of State to prevent secret unbelief; but as secret thoughts do not stalk abroad in public, they can only be known when watched and denounced by spies and doctrinal detectives, who have to look upon acts which are only sins as if they were crimes, and to denounce the unbeliever as a traitor even when he has kept his unbelief to himself. Considering the infinite mobility of thought, every subject of such a State must be under misprision of treason in the eyes of the government, and under misprision of being a spy in the eyes of his fellow-subjects. Thus each man is suspected by his neighbour, society is disrupted, and the only union left to the subjects is that of the secret society, which is secret because it can only associate under such securities as it deems sufficient against delation by its members. And the community, thus broken to fragments, is also secluded from the rest of the world that believes otherwise, or is governed on other principles, for fear of the contagion of liberty. Hence poverty and that stagnation which, in the midst of progress, is really retrogression, are the lot of such states till intercommunication has destroyed the barriers, and has brought the forbidden knowledge into the sequestered community. And then follows the fatal catastrophe, which proves how revolutionary is the desire to carry out the external imitation of ascetic principles in the forms of political life. For it troubles the traditional life of a country by grafting upon it a law which never grew there naturally, and it makes progress impossible by making the law something positive and final, which may be added to

and patched up, or, on the other hand, suffered to sleep, but can never be repealed, and swept out of the way, however great an obstacle it may have become. Thus a superimposed civil code which is contrary to the habits of a people, both ignores the past and destroys the future, and, by the mechanical contrivances which are necessary for its administration and preservation, it infallibly conducts to a revolutionary outbreak against itself.

To pass from the influence of the external forms of ascetical law—poverty, chastity, and obedience—on society and legislation, to the influence of its spirit,—intention, repentance, and the occasions of sin. It is clear that the legislation which looks to the inward intention must be essentially different from that which looks only to the material result, and to the external character of the act. The first estimates acts by the way in which they spring from and react upon the will; the second estimates them by their effect on society. This distinction produces a radical difference in the standards and measures by which men brought up to one or the other system respectively estimate acts. This it is which makes the professionally educated priest so admirable and indispensable a guide for the hidden life, so often a dangerous adviser about social and political questions. This it is which makes the ecclesiastical government of the Roman States so unpopular. The professionally educated priest, as Dr. Döllinger says, “when charged with legislative and administrative functions, finds the extremest difficulty in overcoming the temptation of allowing his individual opinion, his subjective estimate of persons, his compassionateness, and his inclinations, to influence his official dealings. As priest, he is before all things the minister and herald of grace, of reconciliation, of forgiveness. Hence he too easily forgets that in social relations the law is deaf to prayer, and that every time it is bent in favour of one, it injures another, or many others, or the whole community. He gradually gets used to set his own arbitrary will, at first always with the best intention, above the law.” The professional bias of the confessional leads the clerical legislator and judge to attach more importance to the intention than to the deed; thus stimulating hypocrisy in the candidates for employment or reward, and laziness in those employed, and at the same time vitiating the penal law. Under such codes, presumed intentions, and the words which imply them, are punished more severely than the worst crimes. Murderers and brigands will be carelessly thrown back upon society after a few years’ confinement; while suspected

malcontents, whose only overt crime is one of words, will be subjected to lifelong severity. For the moral code of the confessional is full of tenderness for the poor criminal who has done all the evil he can do; but it has no absolution for the man who intends to commit a sin which he has never yet committed, and who obstinately refuses to own it or to purge himself.

The introduction of the principle of repentance into civil law is another infiltration of the subjective moral code into politics. The medieval theory of the relations of the Pope with his dependent princes was marked with this principle. The doctrine was, that as all tyranny is a punishment of the sins of the people, and all revolution a punishment of the sins of the ruler, they may, like other punishments, be wiped away by repentance. A people sins,—God sends a tyrant; it repents,—He destroys the tyrant. A prince sins, and becomes a tyrant,—God raises up foes to dethrone him; he repents,—his enemies are put down, and he is restored. If this were an account of what always works itself out in history, nothing could be more providential. But when it has to be worked out by a human tribunal, it must often leave the impression of great injustice. For instance, suppose John is a tyrant and apostate; the Pope thereupon adjudges his crown to be forfeit, and assigns it, let us say, to Lewis, on condition of his winning it. Lewis grasps eagerly at the prize, and after vast pains seems on the point of securing it, when John repents, makes his submission to the Pope, and claims his right of absolution and restoration. Nothing thereupon is left for Lewis but either to retire, or in turn to become the enemy of the Pope, if he perseveres. While for those of John's subjects who have helped Lewis, in obedience to the Papal decree, there is nothing left but either to submit to John, who has formerly shown himself a perfidious tyrant, or to become at once excommunicated rebels instead of soldiers of the Pope. Complications such as these are endured when they arise from the chances of war, but not when they are caused simply by a human judge applying an ecclesiastical principle to political events. Thus the infiltration of the principle of repentance into legislation frustrated the later medieval claim of the Pope to supremacy over all States in the interests of the Papacy; a claim which had grown out of his admitted consultative authority in the interests of a people oppressed by its rulers, and only awaiting his decision to throw them off.

Again, the subject of "occasions of sin" belongs to the

applied moral code ; it is altogether subjective, personal, and varies with each individual : if generalised and made objective, it often results either in an abridgment of Christian liberty, like the "Maine Liquor Law," when the rights of the strong are sacrificed to the interests of the weak, or, when no such sacrifice is made, in a useless web of ineffective precepts. There cannot be a plainer corollary of the personal duty of avoiding occasions of sin than the prohibition of bad books by the Church. She would perhaps seem to fail in her maternal care if she did not put her mark on books she considered dangerous, and if she did not furnish rules for the guidance of souls in this delicate matter. As long as these rules are subjective, and applied through the confessional, they are such as no Christian can accuse. But make them objective and general, and they at once change their nature. The law being penal, sanctioned by excommunication, and technically odious (*de re odiosa*), must be strictly interpreted, and not stretched beyond the letter. Now the excommunication being for those who knowingly retain, read, print, or defend the books of heretics, and infidels not being formally heretics, their books, though containing heresy, may be read without excommunication.* And as the reading must be done knowingly (*scienter*), a general opinion is, that not only invincible and crass ignorance excuses, but also "affected ignorance," which obviates a formal contempt of the censure. The book must be about religion, or, if not about religion, must contain an error, in order to come under the censure, under which it still remains after the single error is blotted out. Pamphlets, however, such as sermons, and perhaps manuscripts, do not come under the denomination of books ; and the books which may not be read may be listened to, if another reads.† Thus a law which is admirably adapted for the guidance of the individual soul by the confessor becomes a very uncertain and seemingly purposeless guide when made objective, and imposed as a penal law on society, and interpreted as all penal laws must be. And even then it must often be inconvenient to literary men. It is true they may obtain dispensations ; but in the very act of granting a dispensation a new feature of ascetic and subjective morality comes to light.

One object of political legislation is to simplify law and reduce it to a minimum, especially in all odious matter, so

* "Non autem incurrunt (sc. excom.) legentes libros infidelium, licet hæresim contineant."

† S. Alphonsus, Theol. Moral. tom. x. (ed. Heilig, Mechlin, 1846), Appen. de probib. lib. cap. v. dubia 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9.

as to obtrude the authority of the legislator as little as possible on the patience of the subject. But the object of the confessor is ever to keep before the penitent's mind the presence and the authority of the supreme Legislator. Hence it is often held that, in dispensing any dispensable law, care should be taken not to excuse it entirely, but to leave some portion of it in action, lest it should become obsolete and be forgotten. Thus the dispensation permitting the literary man to read condemned books generally excepts some one class of literature, which is still forbidden. In a similar way, the customs in mitigation of fasting which are already established are connived at; but some hold that no general dispensation can be given to alter a use which has no custom against it. The legislator may connive at the breach of a law, but will not authorise the breach beforehand, or abrogate the law, because, subjectively considered, it is good that there should be many laws, in order that the lawgiver may be more frequently called to mind. If this ascetic idea is imitated in politics, it will cause an equal facility in continually putting forth new laws and new edicts, and in conniving at the breach of them,—a multiplicity of laws, continual change of laws, no obedience, and no possibility of progress.

The peculiar usages which we have shown to be derived from the infiltration of the ascetic forms—poverty, chastity, and obedience, and the subjective laws of intention, repentance, and occasions of sin—into the political law are chiefly characteristic of what is called clerical government. The demand for secularising such a government does not mean that its officers should be exclusively or even chiefly laymen, but that it should be administered on secular, not on ecclesiastical principles. What is wanted is the distinction, not the separation, of subjective and objective morals, of ascetic and political law, of Church and State. It does not matter who administers, whether clergyman or layman, provided he recognises the distinction, and has the will and the knowledge to do justice to both sides. The real secularisation wanted is one that will allow the secular government to remain secular without interfering with the ascetic principles of the canon law on which ecclesiastical affairs must be administered, and which will also make the ecclesiastical government remain ecclesiastical, without interfering with the political and economic principles on which society must govern itself.

Christianity, then, has two ends; one heavenly, the other earthly,—“having promise of the world that now is.” By

this she exerts an influence over the State which has the same earthly object, and claims a share in the direction of human progress. But her political success has not equalled her triumphs in the reformation of man and of the family. This failure is partly to be attributed to the want of an adequate distinction between the spheres of ascetic and subjective morality on the one hand, and of political and objective morality on the other. The attempts to reform society by imposing upon it the forms of ascetic life have necessarily failed. And the attempts to reform legislation by principles derived from the forms of asceticism, or from the subjective moral code, have in the long-run proved equally abortive. How, then, is the Church to influence human progress?

Her direct action is only on the individual soul, to which her beatitudes reveal a new life. But they provide no new mechanism for society. For instance, the political obedience of the early Christians differed from that of the pagans in being cheerful and willing, as if paid not to man but to God, not to force but to conscience. The Christian slave suffered more patiently than the pagan, but would not submit to moral degradation, which the pagan slave endured without resistance. This resistance to sin became resistance to wrong as soon as the State became Christian, and thus led to a more settled legality, but not necessarily to any political changes in society. Christianity civilises the nation by making the man moral; but every where she is contented with morality sufficient for heaven, though it should not be sufficient for temporal progress. She always accepts the temporal condition in which she finds her converts, however imperfect it may be. If their state of life is compatible with holiness, she requires no change in it. She leaves Chinese and Esquimaux as they were, without altering their institutions, and imposes no "Christian civilisation" upon them.

Christian civilisation is only possible when the Church finds suitable materials and the proper means. Christianity has been called the "economy of mediation" because its work is all done by mediators. Between God and man is Christ; between Christ and men the Church; between the Church and her flock the pastors; between the Church and society the Christian State; between Church and State the political classes of society. Christian civilisation is impossible, except where nature provides a race capable of receiving it, and a race capable of giving it. The Church was unable to inspire new political life into the effete and exhausted relics of the Roman world. But when the Teuton barbarians, with their bodily vigour and their unexampled political capacity,

overran the Empire, then came her opportunity for teaching the world what Christian civilisation is. That this civilisation has not yet attained its ideal of political excellence seems attributable to the mistake which we have been criticising,—the application of the ascetic idea to a sphere where it was not applicable.

THE PROTESTANT THEORY OF PERSECUTION.

THE manner in which Religion influences State policy is more easily ascertained in the case of Protestantism than in that of the Catholic Church: for whilst the expression of Catholic doctrines is authoritative and unvarying, the great social problems did not all arise at once, and have at various times received different solutions. The reformers failed to construct a complete and harmonious code of doctrine; but they were compelled to supplement the new theology by a body of new rules for the guidance of their followers in those innumerable questions with regard to which the practice of the Church had grown out of the experience of ages. And although the dogmatic system of Protestantism was not completed in their time, yet the Protestant spirit animated them in greater purity and force than it did any later generation. Now, when a religion is applied to the social and political sphere, its general spirit must be considered, rather than its particular precepts. So that, in studying the points of this application in the case of Protestantism, we may consult the writings of the reformers with greater confidence than we could do for an exposition of Protestant theology; and accept them as a greater authority, because they agree more entirely among themselves. We can be more sure that we have the true Protestant opinion in a political or social question on which all the reformers are agreed, than in a theological question on which they differ; for the concurrent opinion must be founded on an element common to all, and therefore essential. If it should further appear that this opinion was injurious to their actual interests, and maintained at a sacrifice to themselves, we should then have an additional security for its necessary connexion with their fundamental views.

The most important example of this law is the Protestant theory of Toleration. The views of the reformers on religious liberty are not fragmentary, accidental opinions,

unconnected with their doctrines, or suggested by the circumstances amidst which they lived ; but the product of their theological system, and of their ideas of political and ecclesiastical government. Civil and religious liberty are so commonly associated in people's mouths, and are so rare in fact, that their definition is evidently as little understood as the principle of their connexion. The point at which they unite, the common root from which they derive their sustenance, is the right of self-government. The modern theory, which has swept away every authority except that of the State, and has made the sovereign power irresistible by multiplying those who share it, is the enemy of that common freedom in which religious freedom is included. It condemns, as a state within the State, every inner group and community, class or corporation, administering its own affairs; and, by proclaiming the abolition of privileges, it emancipates the subjects of every such authority, in order to transfer them exclusively to its own. It recognises liberty only in the individual, because it is only in the individual that liberty can be separated from authority, and the right of conditional obedience deprived of the security of a limited command. Under its sway, therefore, every man may profess his own religion more or less freely ; but his religion is not free to administer its own laws. In other words, religious profession is free, but Church-government is controlled. And where ecclesiastical authority is restricted, religious liberty is virtually denied.

For religious liberty is not the negative right of being without any particular religion, just as self-government is not anarchy. It is the right of religious communities to the practice of their own duties, the enjoyment of their own constitution, and the protection of the law, which equally secures to all the possession of their own independence. Far from implying a general toleration, it is best secured by a limited one. In an indifferent State, that is, in a State without any definite religious character (if such a thing is conceivable), no ecclesiastical authority could exist. A hierarchical organisation would not be tolerated by the sects that have none, or by the enemies of all definite religion ; for it would be in contradiction to the prevailing theory of atomic freedom. Nor can a religion be free when it is alone, unless it makes the State subject to it. For governments restrict the liberty of the favoured Church, by way of remunerating themselves for their service in preserving her unity. The most violent and prolonged conflicts for religious freedom occurred in the middle ages

between a Church which was not threatened by rivals and States which were most attentive to preserve her exclusive predominance. Frederic II., the most tyrannical oppressor of the Church among the German emperors, was the author of those sanguinary laws against heresy which prevailed so long in many parts of Europe. The Inquisition, which upheld the religious unity of the Spanish nation, imposed the severest restrictions on the Spanish Church; and in England conformity has been most rigorously exacted by those sovereigns who have most completely tyrannised over the Established Church. Religious liberty, therefore, is possible only where the coexistence of different religions is admitted, with an equal right to govern themselves according to their own several principles. Tolerance of error is requisite for freedom; but freedom will be most complete where there is no actual diversity to be resisted, and no theoretical unity to be maintained, but where unity exists as the triumph of truth, not of force, through the victory of the Church, not through the enactment of the State.

This freedom is attainable only in communities where rights are sacred, and where law is supreme. If the first duty is held to be obedience to authority, and the preservation of order, as in the case of aristocracies, and monarchies of the patriarchal type, there is no safety for the liberties either of individuals or of religion. Where the highest consideration is the public good and the popular will, as in democracies, and in constitutional monarchies after the French pattern, majority takes the place of authority; an irresistible power is substituted for an idolatrous principle; and all private rights are equally insecure. The true theory of freedom excludes all absolute power and arbitrary action, and requires that a tyrannical or revolutionary government shall be coerced by the people; but it teaches that insurrection is criminal, except as a corrective of revolution and tyranny. In order to understand the views of the Protestant reformers on toleration, they must be considered with reference to these points.

While the Reformation was an act of individual resistance, and not a system, and when the secular powers were engaged in supporting the authority of the Church, the authors of the movement were compelled to claim impunity for their opinions, and they held language regarding the right of governments to interfere with religious belief which resembled that of friends of toleration. Every religious party, however exclusive or servile its theory may be, if it is in contradiction with a system generally accepted and protected

by law, must necessarily, at its first appearance, assume the protection of the idea that the conscience is free.¹ Before a new authority can be set up in the place of one that exists, there is an interval when the right of dissent must be proclaimed. At the beginning of Luther's contest with the Holy See there was no rival authority for him to appeal to. No ecclesiastical organism existed; the civil power was not on his side, and not even a definite system had yet been evolved by controversy out of his original doctrine of justification. His first efforts were acts of hostility; his exhortations were entirely aggressive, and his appeal was to the masses. When the prohibition of his New Testament confirmed him in the belief that no favour was to be expected from the princes, he published his book on the Civil Power, which he judged superior to every thing that had been written on government since the days of the Apostles, and in which he asserts that authority is given to the State only against the wicked, and that it cannot coerce the godly. Princes, he says, are not to be obeyed when they command submission to superstitious errors, but their aid is not to be invoked in support of the Word of God.² Heretics must be converted by the Scriptures, and not by fire, otherwise the hangman would be the greatest doctor.³ At the time when this was written Luther was expecting the bull of excommunication and the ban of the empire, and for several years it appeared doubtful whether he would escape the treatment he condemned. He lived in constant fear of assassination, and his friends amused themselves with his terrors. At one time he believed that a Jew

¹ "Le vrai principe de Luther est celui-ci: La volonté est esclave par nature. . . . Le libre examen a été pour Luther un moyen et non un principe. Il s'en est servi, et était contraint de s'en servir pour établir son vrai principe, qui était la toute-puissance de la foi et de la grâce. . . . C'est ainsi que le libre examen s'imposa au Protestantisme. L'accessoire devint le principal, et la forme dévora plus ou moins le fond." Janet, *Histoire de la Philosophie Morale*, ii. 38, 39.

² "If they prohibit true doctrine, and punish their subjects for receiving the entire sacrament, as Christ ordained it, compel the people to idolatrous practices, with masses for the dead, indulgences, invocation of saints, and the like, in these things they exceed their office, and seek to deprive God of the obedience due to Him. For God requires from us this above all, that we hear His Word, and follow it; but where the government desires to prevent this, the subjects must know that they are not bound to obey it" (Luther's Werke, xiii. 2244). "Non est, mi Spalatine, principum et istius sæculi Pontificum tueri verbum Dei, nec ea gratia ullorum peto præsidium" (Luther's Briefe, ed. De Wette, i. 521, 4th November 1520). "I will compel and urge by force no man; for the faith must be voluntary and not compulsory, and must be adopted without violence." Sermonen an Carlstadt, Werke, xx. 24, 1522.

³ Schrift an den christlichen Adel. Werke, x. 374 (June 1520). His proposition, *Hæreticos comburi esse contra voluntatem spiritus*, was one of those condemned by Leo X. as pestilent, scandalous, and contrary to Christian charity.

had been hired by the Polish Bishops to despatch him; that an invisible physician was on his way to Wittenberg to murder him; that the pulpit from which he preached was impregnated with a subtle poison.⁴ These alarms dictated his language during those early years. It was not the true expression of his views, which he was not yet strong enough openly to put forth.⁵

The Zwinglian schism, the rise of the Anabaptists, and the Peasants' War, altered the aspect of affairs. Luther recognised in them the fruits of his theory of the right of private judgment and of dissent,⁶ and the moment had arrived to secure his Church against the application of the same dissolving principles which had served him to break off from his allegiance to Rome.⁷ The excesses of the social war threatened to deprive the movement of the sympathy of the higher classes, especially of the governments; and with the defeat of the peasants the popular phase of the Reformation came to an end on the Continent. The devil, Luther said, having failed to put him down by the help of the Pope, was seeking his destruction through the preachers of

⁴ "Nihil non tentabunt Romanenses, nec potest satis Huttenus me monere, adeo mihi de veneno timet" (De Wette, i. 487). "Etiam inimici mei quidam miserti per amicos ex Halberstadio fecerunt moneri me: esse quendam doctorem medicinæ, qui arte magica factus pro libito invisibilis, quandam occidit, mandatum habentem et occidendi Lutheri, venturumque ad futuram Dominicam ostensionis reliquiarum: valde hoc constanter narratur" (De Wette, i. 441). "Est hic apud nos Judæus Polonus, missus sub pretio 2000 aureorum, ut me veneno perdat, ab amicis per literas mihi proditus. Doctor est medicinæ, et nihil non audere et facere paratus incredibili astutia et agilitate" (De Wette, ii. 616). See also (Jarcke) *Studien zur Geschichte der Reformation*, 176.

⁵ "Multa ego premo et causa principis et universitatis nostræ cohibeo, quæ (si alibi essem) evomerem in vastatricem Scripturæ et Ecclesiæ Romam. . . . Timeo miser, ne forte non sim dignus pati et occidi pro tali causa: erit ista felicitas meliorum hominum, non tam fœdi peccatoris. Dixi tibi semper me paratum esse cedere loco, si qua ego principi ill. viderer periculo hic vivere. Aliquando certe moriendum est, quanquam jam edita vernacula quadam apologia satis aduler Romanæ Ecclesiæ et Pontifici, si quid forte id prosit" (De Wette, i. 260, 261). "Ubi periculum est, ne iis protectoribus tutus sævius in Romanenses sim grassaturus, quam si sub principis imperio publicis militarem officiis docendi. . . . Ego vicissim, nisi ignem habere nequeam damnabo, publicæque concremabo jus pontificium totum, id est, lernam illam hæresium; et finem habebit humilitatis exhibitæ hæcenusque frustratæ observantia, qua nolo amplius inflari hostes Evangelii." Ibid. 465, 466. 10th July 1520.

⁶ "Out of the Gospel and divine truth come devilish lies; . . . from the blood in our body comes corruption; out of Luther come Mûntzer, and rebels, Anabaptists, Sacramentarians, and false brethren." Werke, i. 75.

⁷ "Habemus," wrote Erasmus, "fructum tui spiritus. . . . Non agnoscis hosce seditiosos, opinor, sed illi te agnoscunt. . . . nec tamen efficis quominus credant homines per tuos libellos. . . . pro libertate evangelica, contra tyrannidem humanam, hisce tumultibus fuisse datam occasionem." "And who will deny," adds a Protestant classic, "that the fault was partly owing to them?" Planck, *Geschichte der Protestantischen Kirche*, ii. 183.

treason and blood.⁸ He instantly turned from the people to the princes;⁹ impressed on his party that character of political dependence, and that habit of passive obedience to the State, which it has ever since retained, and gave it a stability it could never otherwise have acquired. In thus taking refuge in the arms of the civil power, purchasing the safety of his doctrine by the sacrifice of its freedom, and conferring on the State, together with the right of control, the duty of imposing it at the point of the sword, Luther in reality reverted to his original teaching.¹⁰ The notion of liberty, whether civil or religious, was hateful to his despotic nature, and contrary to his interpretation of Scripture. As early as 1519 he had said that even the Turk was to be revered as an authority.¹¹ The demoralising servitude and lawless oppression which the peasants endured, gave them, in his eyes, no right to relief; and when they rushed to arms, invoking his name as their deliverer, he exhorted the nobles to take a merciless revenge.¹² Their crime was, that they were animated by the sectarian spirit, which it was the most important interest of Luther to suppress.

The Protestant authorities throughout Southern Germany were perplexed by their victory over the Anabaptists. It was not easy to show that their political tenets were revolutionary, and the only subversive portion of their doctrine was that they held, with the Catholics, that the State is not

⁸ "Ich sehe das wohl, dass der Teufel, so er mich bisher nicht hat mögen umbringen durch den Pabst, sucht er mich durch die blutdürstigen Mordpropheten und Rottengeister, so unter euch sind, zu vertilgen und auffressen." Werke, xvi. 77.

⁹ Schenkel, Wesen des Protestantismus, iii. 348, 351. Hagen, Geist der Reformation, ii. 146, 151. Menzel, Neuere Geschichte der Deutschen, i. 115.

¹⁰ See the best of his biographies, Jürgens, Luther's Leben, iii. 601.

¹¹ "Quid hoc ad me? qui sciam etiam Turcam honorandum et ferendum potestatis gratia. Quia certus sum non nisi volente Deo ullam potestatem consistere." De Wette, i. 236.

¹² "I beg first of all that you will not help to mollify Count Albert in these matters, but let him go on as he has begun. . . . Encourage him to go on bravely, to leave things in the hands of God, and obey His divine command to wield the sword as long as he can." "Do not allow yourselves to be much disturbed, for it will redound to the advantage of many souls that will be terrified by it, and preserved." "If there are innocent persons amongst them, God will surely save and preserve them, as He did with Lot and Jeremiah. If He does not, then they are certainly not innocent. . . . We must pray for them, that they obey, otherwise this is no time for compassion; just let the guns deal with them." "Sentio melius esse omnes rusticos cædi, quam principes et magistratus, eo quod rustici sine autoritate Dei gladium accipiunt. Quam nequitiam Satanæ sequi non potest nisi mera Satanica vastitas regni Dei, et mundi principes etsi excedunt, tamen gladium autoritatis Dei gerunt. Ibi utrumque regnum consistere potest, quare nulla misericordia, nulla patientia rusticis debetur, sed ira et indignatio Dei et hominum." De Wette, ii. 653, 655, 666, 669, 671.

responsible for religion.¹³ They were punished, therefore, because they taught that no man ought to suffer for his faith. At Nuremberg the magistrates did not know how to proceed against them. They seemed no worse than the Catholics, whom there was no question at that time of exterminating. The celebrated Osiander deemed these scruples inconsistent. The Papists, he said, ought also to be suppressed; and so long as this was not done, it was impossible to proceed to extremities against the Anabaptists, who were no worse than they. Luther also was consulted; and he decided that they ought not to be punished unless they refused to conform to the command of the government.¹⁴ The Margrave of Brandenburg was also advised by the divines that a heretic who could not be converted out of Scripture might be condemned; but that in his sentence nothing should be said about heresy, but only about sedition and murderous intent, though he should be guiltless of these.¹⁵ With the aid of this artifice great numbers were put to death.

Luther's proud and ardent spirit despised such pretences. He had cast off all reserve, and spoke his mind openly on the rights and duties of the State towards the Church and the people. His first step was to proclaim it the office of the civil power to prevent abominations.¹⁶ He provided no security that, in discharging this duty, the sovereign should be guided by the advice of orthodox divines;¹⁷ but he held the duty itself to be imperative. In obedience to the fundamental principle, that the Bible is the sole guide in all things, he defined the office and justified it by scriptural precedents.

¹³ "Wir lehren die christlich Obrigkeit möge nicht nur, sondern solle auch sich der Religion und Glaubenssachen mit Ernst annehmen; davon halten die Wiedertäufer steif das Widerspiel, welches sie auch zum Theil gemein haben mit den Prälaten der römischen Kirche." Declaration of the Protestants, quoted in Jörg, *Deutschland von 1522 bis 1526*, p. 709.

¹⁴ "As to your question, how they are to be punished, I do not consider them blasphemers, but regard them in the light of the Turks, or deluded Christians, whom the civil power has not to punish, at least bodily. But if they refuse to acknowledge and to obey the civil authority, then they forfeit all they have and are, for then sedition and murder are certainly in their hearts." De Wette, ii. 622. Osiander's opinion in Jörg, 706.

¹⁵ "Dass in dem Urtheil und desselben öffentlicher Verkündigung keines Irrthums oder Ketzereien . . . sondern allein der Aufruhr und fügenommenen Morderei, die ihm doch laut seiner Urgicht nie lieb gewesen, gedacht werde." Jörg, 708.

¹⁶ "Principes nostri non cogunt ad fidem et Evangelion, sed cohibent externas abominaciones" (De Wette, iii. 50). "Wenn die weltliche Obrigkeit die Verbrechen wider die zweite Gesetzestafel bestrafen, und aus der menschlichen Gesellschaft tilgen solle, wie vielmehr denn die Verbrecher wider die erste?" Luther, apud Buchholtz, *Geschichte Ferdinands I.*, iii. 571.

¹⁷ Planck, iv. 61, explains why this was not thought of.

The Mosaic code, he argued, awarded to false prophets the punishment of death, and the majesty of God is not to be less deeply revered or less rigorously vindicated under the New Testament than under the Old; in a more perfect revelation the obligation is stronger. Those who will not hear the Church must be excluded from the communion; but the civil power is to intervene when the ecclesiastical excommunication has been pronounced, and men must be compelled to come in. For, according to the more accurate definition of the Church which is given in the Confession of Schmalkald, and in the Apology of the Confession of Augsburg, excommunication involves damnation. There is no salvation to be hoped for out of the Church; and the test of orthodoxy against the Pope, the devil, and all the world, is the dogma of justification by faith.¹⁸

The defence of religion became, on this theory, not only the duty of the civil power, but the object of its institution. Its business was solely the coercion of those who were out of the Church. The faithful could not be the objects of its action; they did of their own accord more than any laws required. A good tree, says Luther, brings forth good fruit by nature, without compulsion; is it not madness to prescribe laws to an apple-tree that it shall bear apples and not thorns?¹⁹ This view naturally proceeded from the axiom of the certainty of the salvation of all who believe in the Confession of Augsburg.²⁰ It is the most important element in Luther's political system, because, while it made all Protestant governments despotic, it led to the rejection of the authority of Catholic governments. This is the point where Protestant and Catholic intolerance meet. If the State were instituted to promote the faith, no obedience could be due to a State of a different faith. Protestants could not conscientiously be faithful subjects of Catholic powers, and they could not therefore be tolerated. Misbelievers would have no rights under an orthodox State, and a misbelieving prince would have no authority over orthodox subjects. The more, therefore, Luther expounded the guilt of resistance and the Divine sanction of authority, the more subversive his influence became in Catholic countries. His system was alike revolutionary, whether he defied the Catholic powers or promoted a Protestant tyranny. He had no notion of politi-

¹⁸ Linde, *Staatskirche*, 23. "Der Papst sammt seinem Haufen glaubt nicht; darum bekennen wir, er werde nicht selig, das ist verdammt werden." *Table-Talk*, ii. 350.

¹⁹ Kaltenborn, *Vorläufer des Grotius*, 208.

²⁰ Möhler, *Symbolik*, 428.

cal right. He found no authority for such a claim in the New Testament, and he held that righteousness does not need to exhibit itself in works.

It was the same helpless dependence on the letter of Scripture which led the reformers to consequences more subversive of Christian morality than their views on questions of polity. When Carlstadt cited the Mosaic law in defence of polygamy, Luther was indignant. If the Mosaic law is to govern every thing, he said, we should be compelled to adopt circumcision.²¹ Nevertheless, as there is no prohibition of polygamy in the New Testament, the reformers were unable to condemn it. They did not forbid it as a matter of Divine law, and referred it entirely to the decision of the civil legislator.²² This, accordingly, was the view which guided Luther and Melancthon in treating the problem, the ultimate solution of which was the separation of England from the Church.²³ When the Landgrave Philip afterwards

²¹ "Quodsi unam legem Mosi cogimur servare, eadem ratione et circumcidemur, et totam legem servare oportebit. . . Nunc vero non sumus amplius sub lege Mosi, sed subjecti legibus civilibus in talibus rebus." Luther to Barnes, 5th Sept. 1531. De Wette, iv. 296.

²² "All things that we find done by the patriarchs in the Old Testament ought to be free and not forbidden. Circumcision is abolished, but not so that it would be a sin to perform it, but optional, neither sinful nor acceptable. . . . In like manner it is not forbidden that a man should have more than one wife. Even at the present day I could not prohibit it; but I would not recommend it" (Commentary on Genesis, 1528; see (Jarcke) Studien, 108). "Ego sane fateor, me non posse prohibere, si quis plures velit uxores ducere, nec repugnat sacris literis: verum tamen apud Christianos id exempli nollem primo introduci, apud quos decet etiam ea intermittere, quæ licita sunt, pro vitando scandalo, et pro honestate vitæ" (De Wette, ii. 459. 13th Jan. 1524). "From these instances of bigamy (Lamech, Jacob) no rule can be drawn for our times; and such examples have no power with us Christians, for we live under our authorities, and are subject to our civil laws." Table-Talk, v. 64.

²³ "Antequam tale repudium probarem potius regi permitterem, alteram reginam quoque ducere, et exemplo patrum et regum duas simul uxores seu reginas habere. . . . Si peccavit ducendo uxorem fratris mortui, peccavit in legem humanam seu civilem; si autem repudiaverit, peccavit in legem mere divinam" (De Wette, iv. 296). "Haud dubie rex Angliæ uxorem fratris mortui ductam retinere potest. . . . docendus quod has res politicas commiserit Deus magistratibus, neque nos alligaverit ad Moisen. . . . Si vult rex successioni prospicere, quanto satius est, id facere sine infamia prioris conjugii. Ac potest id fieri sine ullo periculo conscientie cujusunque aut famæ per polygamiam. Etsi enim non velim concedere polygamiam vulgo, dixi enim supra, nos non ferre leges, tamen in hoc casu propter magnam utilitatem regni, fortassis etiam propter conscientiam regis, ita pronuncio: tutissimum esse regi, si ducat secundam uxorem, priore non abjecta, quia certum est polygamiam non esse prohibitam jure divino, nec res est omnino inusitata" (Melancthon's Opera, ed. Bretschneider, ii. 524, 526). "Nolumus esse auctores divortii, cum conjugium cum jure divino non pugnet. Ili, qui diversum pronunciant, terribiliter exaggerant et exasperant jus divinum. Nos contra exaggeramus in rebus politicis auctoritatem magistratus, quæ profecto non est levis, multaque justa sunt propter magistratus auctoritatem, quæ alioqui in dubium vocantur." Melancthon to Bucer, Bretschneider, ii. 552.

appealed to this opinion, and to the earlier commentaries of Luther, the reformers were compelled to approve his having two wives. Melancthon was a witness at the wedding of the second, and the only reservation was a request that the matter should not be allowed to get abroad.²⁴ It was the same portion of Luther's theology, and the same opposition to the spirit of the Church in the treatment of Scripture, that induced him to believe in astrology and to ridicule the Copernican system.²⁵

His view of the authority of Scripture and his theory of justification both precluded him from appreciating freedom. Christian freedom, he said, consists in the belief that we require no works to attain piety and salvation.²⁶ Thus he became the inventor of the theory of passive obedience, according to which no motives or provocation can justify a revolt; and the party against whom the revolt is directed, whatever its guilt may be, is to be preferred to the party revolting, however just its cause.²⁷ In 1530 he therefore declared that the German princes had no right to resist the Emperor in defence of their religion. It was the duty of a Christian, he said, to suffer wrong, and no breach of oath or of duty could deprive the Emperor of his right to the unconditional obedience of his subjects.²⁸ Even the empire seemed to him a

²⁴ "Suadere non possumus ut introducatur publice et velut lege sanciatu permissio, plures quam unam uxores ducendi. . . . Primum ante omnia cavendum, ne hæc res inducatur in orbem ad modum legis, quam sequendi libera omnibus sit potestas. Deinde considerare dignetur vestra celsitudo scandalum, nimirum quod Evangelio hostes exclamaturi sint, nos similes esse Anabaptistis, qui plures simul duxerunt uxores." De Wette, v. 236. Signed by Luther, Melancthon, and Bucer.

²⁵ "He that would appear wise will not be satisfied with any thing that others do; he must do something for himself, and that must be better than any thing. This fool (Copernicus) wants to overturn the whole science of astronomy. But, as the holy Scriptures tell us, Joshua told the sun to stand still, and not the earth." Table-Talk, iv. 575.

²⁶ "Das ist die christliche Freiheit, der einige Glaube, der da macht, nicht dass wir müßig gehen oder übel thun mögen, sondern dass wir keines Werks bedürfen, die Frömmigkeit und Seligkeit zu erlangen." Sermon von der Freiheit. A Protestant historian, who quotes this passage, goes on to say: "On the other hand, the body must be brought under discipline by every means, in order that it may obey and not burden the inner man. Outward servitude, therefore, assists the progress towards internal freedom." Bensen, Geschichte des Bauernkriegs, 269.

²⁷ Werke, x. 413.

²⁸ "According to Scripture, it is by no means proper that one who would be a Christian should set himself against his superiors, whether by God's permission they act justly or unjustly. But a Christian must suffer violence and wrong, especially from his superiors. . . . As the emperor continues emperor, and princes princes, though they transgress all God's commandments, yea even if they be heathen, so they do even when they do not observe their oath and duty. . . . Sin does not suspend authority and allegiance." De Wette, iii. 560.

despotism, from his scriptural belief that it was a continuation of the last of the four monarchies.²⁹ He preferred submission, in the hope of seeing a future Protestant emperor, to a resistance which might have dismembered the empire if it had succeeded, and in which failure would have been fatal to the Protestants; and he was always afraid to draw the logical consequences of his theory of the duty of Protestants towards Catholic sovereigns. In consequence of this fact, Ranke affirms that the great reformer was also one of the greatest conservatives that ever lived; and his biographer, Jürgens, makes the more discriminating remark that history knows of no man who was at once so great an insurgent and so great an upholder of order as he.³⁰ Neither of these writers understood that the same principle lies at the root both of revolution and of passive obedience, and that the difference is only in the temper of the person who applies it, and in the outward circumstances.

Luther's theory is apparently in opposition to Protestant interests, for it entitles Catholicism to the protection of Catholic powers. He disguised from himself this inconsistency, and reconciled theory with expediency by the calculation that the immense advantages which his system offered to the princes would induce them all to adopt it. For, besides the consolatory doctrine of justification,—“a doctrine original, specious, persuasive, powerful against Rome, and wonderfully adapted, as if prophetically, to the genius of the times which were to follow,”³¹—he bribed the princes with the wealth of the Church, independence of ecclesiastical authority, facilities for polygamy, and absolute power. He told the peasants not to take arms against the Church unless they could persuade the government to give the order; but thinking it probable, in 1522, that the Catholic clergy would, in spite of his advice, be exterminated by the fury of the people, he urged the governments to suppress them, because what was done by the constituted authority could not be wrong.³² Persuaded that the sovereign power would be on his side, he allowed no limits to its extent. It is absurd, he says, to imagine that, even with the best intentions kings can avoid committing occasional injustice; they stand, therefore, particularly in need—not of safeguards against the

²⁹ Ranke, *Reformation*, iii. 183.

³⁰ Ranke, iv. 7; Jürgens, iii. 601.

³¹ Newman, *Lectures on Justification*, 386.

³² “Was durch ordentliche Gewalt geschieht ist nicht für Aufruhr zu halten.” Bensen, 269; (Jarcke) *Studien*, 312; Janet, ii. 40.

abuse of power, but—of the forgiveness of sins.³³ The power thus concentrated in the hands of the rulers for the guardianship of the faith, he wished to be used with the utmost severity against unregenerate men, in whom there was neither moral virtue nor civil rights, and from whom no good could come until they were converted. He therefore required that all crimes should be most cruelly punished, and that the secular arm should be employed to convert where it did not destroy. The idea of mercy tempering justice he denounced as a Popish superstition.³⁴

The chief object of the severity thus recommended was of course efficaciously to promote the end for which government itself was held to be instituted. The clergy had authority over the consciences, but it was thought necessary that they should be supported by the State with the obsolete penalties of outlawry, in order that error might be exterminated, although it was impossible to banish sin.³⁵ No government, it was maintained, could tolerate heresy without being responsible for the souls that were seduced by it;³⁶ and as Ezechiel destroyed the brazen serpent to prevent idolatry, the Mass must be suppressed, for the Mass was the worst kind of idolatry.³⁷ In 1530, when it was proposed to leave the matters in dispute to the decision of the future council, Luther declared that the Mass and monastic life could not be tolerated in the mean time, because it was

³³ "Princes, and all rulers and governments, however pious and god-fearing they may be, cannot be without sin in their office and temporal administration. . . . They cannot always be so exactly just and successful as some wiseacres suppose; therefore they are above all in need of the forgiveness of sins." See Kaltenborn, 209.

³⁴ "Of old, under the Papacy, princes and lords, and all judges, were very timid in shedding blood, and punishing robbers, murderers, thieves, and all manner of evil-doers; for they knew not how to distinguish a private individual who is not in office from one in office, charged with the duty of punishing. . . . The executioner had always to do penance, and to apologise beforehand to the convicted criminal for what he was going to do to him, just as if it was sinful and wrong." "Thus they were persuaded by monks to be gracious, indulgent, and peaceable. But authorities, princes, and lords, ought not to be merciful." *Table-Talk*, iv. 159, 160.

³⁵ "Den weltlichen Bann sollten Könige und Kaiser wieder aufrichten, denn wir können ihn jetzt nicht anrichten. . . . Aber so wir nicht können die Sünde des Lebens bannen und strafen, so bannen wir doch die Sünde der Lehre." *Bruns, Luther's Predigten*, 63.

³⁶ "Wo sie solche Rottengeister würden zulassen und leiden, so sie es doch wehren und vorkommen können, würden sie ihre Gewissen gräulich beschweren, und vielleicht nimmermehr widder stillen können, nicht allein der Seelen halben, die dadurch verführt und verdammt werden . . . sondern auch der ganzen heiligen Kirchen halben." *De Wette*, iv. 355.

³⁷ "Nu ist alle Abgötterey gegen die Messe ein geringes." *De Wette*, v. 191. See iv. 307.

unlawful to connive at error.³⁸ "It will lie heavy on your conscience," he writes to the Duke of Saxony, "if you tolerate the Catholic worship; for no secular prince can permit his subjects to be divided by the preaching of opposite doctrines. The Catholics have no right to complain, for they do not prove the truth of their doctrine from Scripture, and therefore do not conscientiously believe it."³⁹ He would tolerate them only if they acknowledged themselves, like the Jews, enemies of Christ and of the Emperor, and consented to exist as outcasts of society.⁴⁰ Heretics, he said, are not to be disputed with, but to be condemned unheard, and whilst they perish by fire, the faithful ought to pursue the evil to its source, and bathe their hands in the blood of the Catholic Bishops, and of the Pope, who is a devil in disguise.⁴¹

The persecuting principles which were involved in Luther's system, but which he cared neither to develop, to apply, nor to defend, were formed into a definite theory by the colder genius of Melancthon. Destitute of Luther's confidence in his own strength, and in the infallible success of his doctrine, he clung more eagerly to the hope of achieving victory by the use of physical force. Like his master, he too hesitated at first, and opposed the use of severe measures against the Zwickau prophets; but when he saw the development of that early germ of dissent, and the gradual dissolution of Lutheran unity, he repented of his ill-timed clemency.⁴² He was not deterred from asserting the duty of persecution by the risk of putting arms into the hands of the enemies of the Reformation. He acknowledged the danger, but he denied the right. Catholic powers, he deemed, might justly persecute, but they could only persecute error. They must apply the same criterions which the Lutherans applied, and then they were justified in persecuting those

³⁸ Bucholtz, iii. 570.

³⁹ "Sie aber verachten die Schrift muthwilliglich, darum wären sie billig aus der einigen Ursach zu stillen, oder nicht zu leiden." De Wette, iii. 90.

⁴⁰ "Wollen sie aber wie die Juden seyn, nicht Christen heissen, noch Kaisers Glieder, sondern sich lassen Christus und Kaisers Feinde nennen, wie die Juden; wohlan, so wollen wirs auch leiden, dass sie in ihren Synagogen, wie die Juden, verschlossen lästern, so lang sie wollen." De Wette, iv. 94.

⁴¹ Riffel, Kirchengeschichte, ii. 9. Table-Talk, iii. 175.

⁴² "Ego ab initio, cum primum cœpi nosse Ciconiam et Ciconiæ factionem, unde hoc totum genus Anabaptistarum exortum est, fui stulte clemens. Sentiebant enim et alii hæreticos non esse ferro opprimendos. Et tunc dux Fridericus vehementer iratus erat Ciconiæ: ac nisi a nobis tectus esset, fuisset de homine furioso et perditæ malo sumtum supplicium. Nunc me ejus clementiæ non parum pœnitet. . . . Brentius nimis clemens est." Bretschneider, ii. 17. Feb. 1530.

whom the Lutherans also proscribed. For the civil power had no right to proscribe a religion in order to save itself from the dangers of a distracted and divided population. The judge of the fact and of the danger must be, not the magistrate, but the clergy.⁴³ The crime lay, not in dissent, but in error. Here, therefore, Melanchthon repudiated the theory and practice of the Catholics, whose aid he invoked; for all intolerance in the Catholic times was founded on the combination of two ideas,—the criminality of apostasy, and the inability of the State to maintain its authority where the moral sense of a part of the community was in opposition to it. The reformers, therefore, approved the Catholic practice of intolerance, and even encouraged it, although their own principles of persecution were destitute not only of connexion, but even of analogy, with it. By simply accepting the inheritance of the medieval theory of the religious unity of the empire, they would have been its victims. By asserting that persecution was justifiable only against error, that is, only when purely religious, they set up a shield for themselves, and a sword against those sects for whose destruction they were more eager than the Catholics. Whether we refer the origin of Protestant intolerance to the doctrines or to the interests of the Reformation, it appears totally unconnected with the tradition of Catholic ages, or the atmosphere of Catholicism. All severities exercised by Catholics before that time had a practical motive; but Protestant persecution was based on a purely speculative foundation, and was due partly to the influence of Scripture examples, partly to the supposed interests of the Protestant party. It never admitted the exclusion of dissent to be a political right of the State, but maintained the suppression of error to be its political duty. To say, therefore, that the Protestants learnt persecution from the Catholics, is as false as to say that they used it by way of revenge. For they founded it on very different and contradictory grounds, and they admitted the right of the Catholics to persecute even the Protestant sects.

Melanchthon taught that the sects ought to be put down by the sword, and that any individual who started new

⁴³ "Sed obijciunt exemplum nobis periculosum: si hæc pertinent ad magistratus, quoties igitur magistratus judicabit aliquos errare, sæviet in eos. Cæsar igitur debet nos opprimere, quoniam ita judicat nos errare. Respondeo: certe debet errores et prohibere et punire. . . . Non est enim solius Cæsaris cognitio, sicut in urbibus hæc cognitio non est tantum magistratus prophani, sed est doctorum. Viderit igitur magistratus ut recte judicet" (Bretschneider, ii. 712). "Deliberent igitur principes, non cum tyrannis, non cum pontificibus, non cum hypocritis, monachis aut aliis, sed cum ipsa Evangelii voce, cum probatis scriptoribus." Bretschneider, iii. 254.

opinions ought to be punished with death.⁴⁴ He carefully laid down that these severities were requisite, not in consideration of the danger to the State, nor of immoral teaching, nor even of such differences as would weaken the authority or arrest the action of the ecclesiastical organisation, but simply on account of a difference, however slight, in the theologumena of Protestantism.⁴⁵ Thamer, who held the possibility of salvation among the heathen; Schwenkfeld, who taught that not the written Word, but the internal illumination of grace in the soul, was the channel of God's influence on man; the Zwinglians, with their error on the Eucharist,—all these met with no more favour than the fanatical Anabaptists.⁴⁶ The State was held bound to vindicate the first table of the law with the same severity as those commandments on which civil society depends for its existence. The government of

⁴⁴ "Quare ita sentias, magistratum debere uti summa severitate in coercendis hujusmodi spiritibus. . . Sines igitur novis exemplis timorem incuti multitudini. . . ad hæc notæ tibi sint causæ seditionum, quas gladio prohiberi oportet. . . Propterea sentio de his qui etiamsi non defendunt seditiosos articulos, habent manifeste blasphemos, quod interfici a magistratu debeant" (ii. 17, 18). "De Anabaptistis tulimus hic in genere sententiam: quia constat sectam diabolicam esse, non esse tolerandam: dissipari enim ecclesiam per eos, cum ipsi nullam habeant certam doctrinam. . . Ideo in capita factionum in singulis locis ultima supplicia constituenda esse judicavimus" (ii. 549). "It is clear that it is the duty of secular government to punish blasphemy, false doctrine, and heresy, on the bodies of those who are guilty of them. . . Since it is evident that there are gross errors in the articles of the Anabaptist sect, we conclude that in this case the obstinate ought to be punished with death" (iii. 199). "Propter hanc causam Deus ordinavit politiam ut Evangelium propagari possit. . . nec revocamus politiam Moysi, sed lex moralis perpetua est omnium ætatum. . . quandocumque constat doctrinam esse impiam, nihil dubium est quin senior pars Ecclesiæ debeat malos pastores removere et abolere impios cultus. Et hanc emendationem præcipue adjuvare debent magistratus, tanquam potiora membra Ecclesiæ" (iii. 242, 244). "Thammerus, qui Mahometicas seu Ethnicas opiniones spargit, vagatur in diocesi Mindensi, quem publicis suppliciis adficere debebant. . . Evomit blasphemias, quæ refutandæ sunt non tantum disputatione aut scriptis, sed etiam justo officio pii magistratus" (ix. 125, 131).

⁴⁵ "Voco autem blasphemos qui articulos habent, qui proprie non pertinent ad civilem statum, sed continent *theoplas* ut de divinitate Christi et similes. Etsi enim gradus quidam sunt, tamen huc etiam refero baptismum infantum. . . Quia magistratui commissa est tutela totius legis, quod atinet ad externam disciplinam et externa facta. Quare delicta externa contra primam tabulam prohibere ac punire debet. . . Quare non solum concessum est, sed etiam mandatum est magistratui, impias doctrinas abolere, et tueri pias in suis ditionibus" (ii. 711). "Ecclesiastica potestas tantum judicat et excommunicat hæreticos, non occidit. Sed potestas civilis debet constituere pœnas et supplicia in hæreticos, sicut in blasphemos constituit supplicia. . . Non enim plectitur fides, sed hæresis" (xii. 697).

⁴⁶ "Notum est etiam, quosdam tetra et *δύσφηνα* dixisse de sanguine Christi, quos puniri oportuit, et propter gloriam Christi, et exempli causa" (viii. 553). "Argumentatur ille præstigiator (Schwenkfeld), verbum externum non esse medium, quo Deus est efficax. Talis sophistica principum severitate compescenda erat" (ix. 579).

the Church being administered by the civil magistrates, it was their office also to enforce the ordinances of religion ; and the same power whose voice proclaimed religious orthodoxy and law, held in its hand the sword by which they were enforced. No religious authority existed except through the civil power.⁴⁷ The Church was merged in the State ; but the laws of the State, in return, were identified with the commandments of religion.⁴⁸

In accordance with these principles, the condemnation of Servetus by a civil tribunal, which had no authority over him, and no jurisdiction over his crime,—the most aggressive and revolutionary act, therefore, that is conceivable in the casuistry of persecution,—was highly approved by Melancthon. He declared it a most useful example for all future ages, and could not understand that there should be any who did not regard it in the same favourable light.⁴⁹ It is true that Servetus, by denying the divinity of Christ, was open to the charge of blasphemy in a stricter sense than that in which the reformers generally applied it. But this was not the case with the Catholics. They did not represent, like the sects, an element of dissolution in Protestantism, and the bulk of their doctrine was admitted by the reformers. They were not in revolt against existing authority ; they required no special innovations for their protection ; they demanded only that the change of religion should not be compulsory. Yet Melancthon held that they too were to be proscribed, because

⁴⁷ "The office of preacher is distinct from that of governor, yet both have to contribute to the praise of God. Princes are not only to protect the goods and bodily life of their subjects, but the principal function is to promote the honour of God, and to prevent idolatry and blasphemy" (iii. 199). "Errant igitur magistratus, qui divellunt gubernationem a fine, et se tantum pacis ac ventris custodes esse exsistimant. . . . At si tantum venter curandus esset, quid differrent principes ab armentariis? Nam longe aliter sentiendum est. Politias divinitus admirabili sapientia et bonitate constitutas esse, non tantum ad quærenda et fruenda ventris bona, sed multo magis, ut Deus in societate innotescat, ut æterna bona quærantur" (iii. 246).

⁴⁸ "Neque illa barbarica excusatio audienda est, leges illas pertinere ad politiam Mosaicam, non ad nostram. Ut Decalogus ipse ad omnes pertinet, ita iudex ubique omnia Decalogi officia in externa disciplina tueatur" (viii. 520).

⁴⁹ "Legi scriptum tuum, in quo refutasti luculenter horrendas Serveti blasphemias, ac filio Dei gratias ago, qui fuit *ὑπερβουλις* hujus tui agonis. Tibi quoque Ecclesia et nunc et ad posteros gratitudinem debet et debebit. Tuo iudicio prorsus adsentior. Affirmo etiam, vestros magistratus juste fecisse, quod hominem blasphemum, re ordine judicata, interfecerunt" (Melancthon to Calvin. Bretschneider, viii. 362). "Judico etiam Senatum Genevensem recte fecisse, quod hominem pertinacem et non omissurum blasphemias sustulit. Ac miratus sum, esse, qui severitatem illam improbant" (viii. 523). "Dedit vero et Genevensis reip. magistratus ante annos quatuor punitæ insanabilis blasphemix adversus filium Dei, sublato Serveto Arragone pium et memorabile ad omnem posteritatem exemplum" (ix. 133).

their worship was idolatrous.⁵⁰ In doing this, he adopted the principle of aggressive intolerance, which was at that time new to the Christian world, and which the Popes and councils of the Catholic Church had condemned when the zeal of laymen had gone beyond the lawful measure. In the middle ages there had been persecution far more sanguinary than any that has been inflicted by Protestants. Various motives had occasioned it, and various arguments had been used in its defence. But the principle on which the Protestants oppressed the Catholics was new. The Catholics had never admitted the theory of absolute toleration, as it was defined at first by Luther, and afterwards by some of the sects. In principle, their tolerance differed from that of the Protestants as widely as their intolerance. They had exterminated sects which, like the Albigenses, threatened to overturn the fabric of Christian society. They had proscribed different religions where the State was founded on religious unity, and where this unity formed an integral part of its laws and administration. They had gone one step further, and punished those whom the Church condemned as apostates; thereby vindicating, not, as in the first case, the moral basis of society, nor, as in the second, the religious foundation of the State; but the authority of the Church, and the purity of her doctrine, on which they relied as the pillar and bulwark of the social and political order. Where a portion of the inhabitants of any country preferred a different creed, Jew, Mahomedan, heathen, or schismatic, they had been generally tolerated, with enjoyment of property and personal freedom, but not with that of political power or autonomy. But political freedom had been denied them because they did not admit the common ideas of duty which were its basis. This position, however, was not tenable, and was the source of great disorders. The Protestants, in like manner, could give reasons for several kinds of persecution. They could bring the Socinians under the category of blasphemers; and blasphemy, like the ridicule of sacred things, destroys reverence and awe, and tends to the destruction of society. The Anabaptists, they might argue, were revolutionary fanatics, whose doctrines were subversive of the civil order; and the dogmatic sects threatened the ruin of ecclesiastical unity within the Protestant community itself. But by placing the neces-

⁵⁰ "Abusus missæ per magistratus debet tolli. Non aliter, atque sustulit æneum serpentem Ezechias, aut excelsa demolitus est Josias" (i. 480). "Politiciis magistratibus severissime mandatum est, ut suo quisque loco manibus et armis tollant statuas, ad quas fiunt hominum concursus et invocationes, et puniant suppliciis corporum insanabiles, qui idolorum cultum pertinaciter retinent, aut blasphemias serunt" (ix. 77).

sity of intolerance on the simple ground of religious error, and in directing it against the Church which they themselves had abandoned, they introduced a purely subjective test, and a purely revolutionary system. It is on this account that the *tu quoque*, or retaliatory argument, is inadmissible between Catholics and Protestants. Catholic intolerance is handed down from an age when unity subsisted, and when its preservation, being essential for that of society, became a necessity of State as well as a result of circumstances. Protestant intolerance, on the contrary, was the peculiar fruit of a dogmatic system, in contradiction with the facts and principles on which the intolerance actually existing among Catholics was founded. Spanish intolerance has been infinitely more sanguinary than Swedish; but in Spain, independently of the interests of religion, there were strong political and social reasons to justify persecution without seeking any theory to prop it up; whilst in Sweden all those practical considerations have either been wanting, or have been opposed to persecution, which has consequently had no justification except the theory of the Reformation. The only instance in which the Protestant theory has been adopted by Catholics is the revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

Towards the end of his life, Melanchthon having ceased to be a strict Lutheran, receded somewhat from his former uncompromising position, and was adverse to a strict scrutiny into minor theological differences. He drew a distinction between errors that required punishment and variations that were not of practical importance.⁵¹ The English Calvinists who took refuge in Germany in the reign of Mary Tudor were ungraciously received by those who were stricter Lutherans than Melanchthon. He was consulted concerning the course to be adopted towards the refugees, and he recommended toleration. But both at Wesel and at Frankfort his advice was, to his great disgust, overruled.⁵²

⁵¹ "If the French and English community at Frankfort shared the errors of Servetus or Thamer, or other enemies of the Symbols, or the errors of the Anabaptists on infant baptism, against the authority of the state, &c., I should faithfully advise and strongly recommend that they should be soon driven away; for the civil power is bound to prevent and to punish proved blasphemy and sedition. But I find that this community is orthodox in the symbolical articles on the Son of God, and in other articles of the Symbol. . . . If the faith of the citizens in every town were inquired into, what trouble and confusion would not arise in many countries and towns!" (ix. 179.)

⁵² Schmidt, Philipp Melanchthon, 640. His exhortations to the Landgrave to put down the Zwinglians are characteristic: "The Zwinglians, without waiting for the council, persecute the Papists and the Anabaptists; why must it be wrong for others to prohibit their indefensible doctrine independent of the council?" Philip replied: "Forcibly to prohibit a doctrine

The severities of the Protestants were chiefly provoked by the Anabaptists, who denied the lawfulness of civil government, and strove to realise the kingdom of God on earth by absorbing the State in the Church.⁵³ None protested more loudly than they against the Lutheran intolerance, or suffered from it more severely. But while denying the spiritual authority of the State, they claimed for their religious community a still more absolute right of punishing error by death. Though they sacrificed government to religion, the effect was the same as that of absorbing the Church in the State. In 1524, Munzer published a sermon, in which he besought the Lutheran princes to extirpate Catholicism. "Have no remorse," he says; "for He to whom all power is given in heaven and on earth means to govern alone."⁵⁴ He demanded the punishment of all heretics, the destruction of all who were not of his faith, and the institution of religious unity. "Do not pretend," he says, "that the power of God will accomplish it without the use of your sword, or it will grow rusty in the scabbard. The tree that bringeth not forth good fruit must be cut down and cast into the fire." And elsewhere, "The ungodly have no right to live, except so far as the elect choose to grant it them."⁵⁵ When the Anabaptists were supreme at Munster, they exhibited the same intolerance. At seven in the morning of Friday, 27th February 1534, they ran through the streets crying, "Away with the ungodly! God will awake and chastise you!" Breaking into the houses of those who refused their baptism, they drove the men out of the town, and forcibly rebaptised the women who remained behind.⁵⁶

which neither contradicts the articles of faith nor encourages sedition, I do not think right. . . . When Luther began to write and to preach, he admonished and instructed the government that it had no right to forbid books, or to prevent preaching, and that its office did not extend so far, but that it had only to govern the body and goods. . . . I had not heard before that the Zwinglians persecute the Papists; but if they abolish abuses, it is not unjust, for the Papists wish to deserve heaven by their works, and so blaspheme the Son of God. That they should persecute the Anabaptists is also not wrong, for their doctrine is in part seditious." The divines answered: "If by God's grace our true and necessary doctrine is tolerated as it has hitherto been by the emperor, though reluctantly, we think that we ought not to prevent it by undertaking the defence of the Zwinglian doctrine, if that should not be tolerated. . . . As to the argument that we ought to spare the people while persecuting the leaders, our answer is, that it is not a question of persons, but only of doctrine, whether it be true or false." Correspondence of Brenz and Melancthon with Landgrave Philip of Hesse. Bretschneider, ii. 95, 98, 101.

⁵³ Hardwicke, *Reformation*, 274.

⁵⁴ Seidemann, *Thomas Münzer*, 35.

⁵⁵ Schenkel, iii. 381.

⁵⁶ Heinrich Grosbeck's *Bericht*, ed. Cornelius, 19.

Whilst, therefore, the Anabaptists were punished for questioning the authority of the Lutherans in religious matters, they practically justified their persecution by their own intolerant doctrines. In fact, they carried the Protestant principles of persecution to an extreme. For whereas the Lutherans regarded the defence of truth and punishment of error as being, in part, the object of the institution of civil government, they recognised it as an advantage by which the State was rewarded for its pains ; but the Anabaptists repudiated the political element altogether, and held that error should be exterminated solely for the sake of truth, and at the expense of all existing States.

Bucer, whose position in the history of the Reformation is so peculiar, and who differed in important points from the Saxon leaders, agreed with them on the necessity of persecuting. He was so anxious for the success of Protestantism, that he was ready to sacrifice and renounce important doctrines, in order to save the appearance of unity ;⁵⁷ but those opinions in which he took so little dogmatic interest, he was resolved to defend by force. He was very much dissatisfied with the reluctance of the Senate of Strasburg to adopt severe measures against the Catholics. His colleague Capito was singularly tolerant ; for the feeling of the inhabitants was not decidedly in favour of the change.⁵⁸ But Bucer, his biographer tells us, was, in spite of his inclination to mediate, not friendly to this temporising system ; partly because he had an organising intellect, which relied greatly on practical discipline to preserve what had been conquered, and on restriction of liberty to be the most certain security for its preservation ; partly because he had a deep insight into the nature of various religious tendencies, and was justly alarmed at their consequences for Church and State.⁵⁹ This point in the character of Bucer provoked a powerful resistance to his system of ecclesiastical discipline ; for it was feared that he would give to the clergy a tyrannical power.⁶⁰ It is true that the demoralisation which ensued on the destruction of the old ecclesiastical authority rendered a strict attention on the part of the State to the affairs of religion highly necessary.⁶¹ The pri-

⁵⁷ Herzog, *Encyclopädie für Protestantische Theologie*, ii, 418.

⁵⁸ Bussierre, *Etablissement du Protestantisme en Alsace*, 429.

⁵⁹ Baum, *Capito und Butzer*, 489.

⁶⁰ Baum, 492. Erbkam, *Protestantische Sekten*, 581.

⁶¹ Ursinus writes to Bullinger: "*Liberavit nos Deus ab idolatria: succedit licentia infinita et horribilis divini nominis, ecclesiæ doctrinæ purioris et sacra-*

vate and confidential communications of the German reformers give a more hideous picture of the moral condition of the generation which followed the Reformation than they draw in their published writings of that which preceded it. It is on this account that Bucer so strongly insisted on the necessity of the interference of the civil power in support of the discipline of the Church.

The Swiss reformers, between whom and the Saxons Bucer forms a connecting link, differ from them in one respect, which greatly influenced their notions of government. Luther lived under a monarchy which was almost absolute, and in which the common people, who were of Slavonic origin, were in the position of the most abject servitude; but the divines of Zurich and Bern were republicans. They did not therefore entertain his exalted views as to the irresistible might of the State; and instead of requiring as absolute a theory of the indefectibility of the civil power as he did, they were satisfied with obtaining a preponderating influence for themselves. Where the power was in hands less favourable to their cause, they had less inducement to exaggerate its rights.

Zwingli abolishes both the distinction between Church and State, and the notion of ecclesiastical authority. In his system, the civil rulers possess the spiritual functions; and, as their foremost duty is the preservation and promotion of the true religion, it is their business to preach. As magistrates are too much occupied with other things, they must delegate the ministry of the word to preachers, for whose orthodoxy they have to provide. They are bound to establish uniformity of doctrine, and to defend it against papists and heretics. This is not only their right, but their duty; and not only their duty, but the condition on which they retain office.⁶² Rulers who do not act in accordance with it are to be dismissed. Thus Zwingli combined persecution and revolution in the same doctrine. But he was not a fanatical persecutor; and his severity was directed less against the Catholics than against the Anabaptists,⁶³ whose prohibition of all civil offices was more subversive of order in a

mentorum prophanatio et sub pedibus porcorum et canum, conniventibus atque utinam non defendentibus iis qui prohibere suo loco debebant, conculcatio." Sudhoff, Olevianus und Ursinus, 340.

⁶² "Adserere audemus, neminem magistratum recte gerere ne posse quidem, nisi Christianus sit" (Zwingli Opera, iii. 296). "If they shall proceed in an unbrotherly way, and against the ordinance of Christ, then let them be deposed, in God's name." Schenkel, iii. 362.

⁶³ Christoffel, Huldreich Zwingli, 251.

republic than in a monarchy. Even, however, in the case of the Anabaptists, the special provocation was—not the peril to the State, nor the scandal of their errors, but—the schism which weakened the Church.⁶⁴ The punishment of heresy for the glory of God was almost inconsistent with the theory that there is no ecclesiastical power. It was not so much provoked in Zurich as elsewhere, because in a small republican community, where the governing body was supreme over both civil and religious affairs, religious unity was a matter of course. The practical necessity of maintaining unity put out of sight the speculative question of the guilt and penalty of error.

Soon after Zwingli's death, Leo Judæ called for severer measures against the Catholics, expressly stating, however, that they did not deserve death. Excommunication, he said, was too light a punishment to be inflicted by the State, which wields the sword, and the faults in question were not great enough to involve the danger of death.⁶⁵ Afterwards he fell into doubts as to the propriety of severe measures against dissenters; but his friends Bullinger and Capito succeeded in removing his scruples, and in obtaining his acquiescence in that intolerance, which was, says his biographer, a question of life and death for the Protestant Church.⁶⁶ Bullinger took, like Zwingli, a more practical view of the question than was common in Germany. He thought it safer strictly to exclude religious differences than to put them down with fire and sword; for in this case, he says, the victims compare themselves to the early martyrs, and make their punishment a weapon of defence.⁶⁷ He did not, however, forbid capital punishment in cases of heresy. In the year 1535 he drew up an opinion on the treatment of religious error, which is written in a tone of great moderation. In this document he says that all sects which introduce division into the Church must be put down, and not only such as, like the Anabaptists, threaten to subvert society; for the destruction of order and unity often begins in an apparently harmless or imperceptible way. The culprit should be examined with gentleness. If his disposition is good, he will not refuse in-

⁶⁴ Zwingli's advice to the Protestants of St. Gall, in Pressel, Joachim Vadian, 45.

⁶⁵ Pestalozzi, Heinrich Bullinger, 95.

⁶⁶ Id., Leo Judæ, 50.

⁶⁷ Id., Bullinger, 146.

struction ; if not, still patience must be shown until there is no hope of converting him. Then he must be treated like other malefactors, and handed over to the torturer and the executioner.⁶⁸ After this time there were no executions for religion in Zurich, and the number, even in the lifetime of Zwingli, was less considerable than in many other places. But it was still understood that confirmed heretics would be put to death. In 1546, in answer to the Pope's invitation to the Council of Trent, Bullinger indignantly repudiates the insinuation that the Protestant cantons were heretical ; "for, by the grace of God, we have always punished the vices of heresy and sodomy with fire, and have looked upon them, and still look upon them, with horror."⁶⁹ This accusation of heresy inflamed the zeal of the reformers against heretics, in order to prove to the Catholics that they had no sympathy with them. On these grounds Bullinger recommended the execution of Servetus. "If the high council inflicts on him the fate due to a worthless blasphemer, all the world will see that the people of Geneva hate blasphemers, and that they punish with the sword of justice heretics who are obstinate in their heresy. . . . Strict fidelity and vigilance are needed, because our churches are in ill-repute abroad, as if we were heretics and friends of heresy. Now God's holy providence has furnished an opportunity of clearing ourselves of this evil suspicion."⁷⁰ After the event, he advised Calvin to justify it, as there were some who were taken aback. "Every where," he says, "there are excellent men who are convinced that godless and blaspheming men ought not only to be rebuked and imprisoned, but also to be put to death. . . . How Servetus could have been spared, I cannot see."⁷¹

The position of Ecolampadius in reference to these questions was altogether singular and exceptional. He dreaded the absorption of the ecclesiastical functions by the State, and sought to avoid it by the introduction of a council of twelve elders, partly magistrates, partly clergy, to direct ecclesiastical affairs. Many things, he said, are

⁶⁸ 149.⁶⁹ 270.⁷⁰ 426.

⁷¹ 428. In the year 1555 he writes to Socinus: "I too am of opinion that heretical men must be cut off with the spiritual sword. . . . The Lutherans at first did not understand that sectaries must be restrained and punished, but after the fall of Munster, when thousands of poor misguided men, many of them orthodox, had perished, they were compelled to admit that it is wiser and better for the government not only to restrain wrong-headed men, but also, by putting to death a few that deserve it, to protect thousands of inhabitants." *Ibid.*

punished by the secular power less severely than the dignity of the Church demands. On the other hand, it punishes the repentant, to whom the Church shows mercy. Either it blunts the edge of its sword by not punishing the guilty, or it brings some hatred on the Gospel by severity.⁷² But the people of Basil were deaf to the arguments of the reformer, and here, as elsewhere, the civil power usurped the office of the Church. In harmony with this jealousy of political interference, Œcolampadius was very merciful to the Anabaptists. Severe penalties, he said, were likely to aggravate the evil; forgiveness would hasten the cure.⁷³ A few months later, however, he regretted this leniency. "We perceive," he writes to a friend, "that we have sometimes shown too much indulgence; but this is better than to proceed tyrannically, or to surrender the keys of the Church."⁷⁴ Whilst, on the other hand, he rejoiced at the expulsion of the Catholics, he ingeniously justified the practice of the Catholic persecutors. "In the early ages of the Church, when the divinity of Christ manifested itself to the world by miracles, God incited the Apostles to treat the ungodly with severity. When the miracles ceased, and the faith was universally adopted, He gained the hearts of princes and rulers, so that they undertook to protect with the sword the gentleness and patience of the Church. They rigorously resisted, in fulfilment of the duties of their office, the contemners of the Church."⁷⁵ The clergy, he goes on to say, became tyrannical because they usurped to themselves a power which they ought to have shared with others; and as the people dread the return of this tyranny of ecclesiastical authority, it is wiser for the Protestant clergy to make no use of the similar power of excommunication which is intrusted to them.

Calvin, as the subject of an absolute monarch, and the ruling spirit in a republic, differed both from the German and the Swiss reformers in his idea of the State both in its object and in its duty towards the Church. An exile from his own country, he had lost the associations and habits of monarchy, and his views of discipline as well as doctrine were matured before he took up his abode in Swit-

⁷² Herzog, *Leben Œkolampads*, ii. 197.

⁷³ 189.

⁷⁴ 206.

⁷⁵ 195. Herzog finds an excuse for the harsh treatment of the Lutherans at Basil in the still greater severity of the Lutheran Churches against the followers of the Swiss reformation, 213.

zerland.⁷⁶ His system was not founded on existing facts; it had no roots in history, but was purely ideal, speculative, and therefore more consistent and inflexible than any other. Luther's political ideas were bounded by the horizon of the monarchical absolutism under which he lived. Zwingli's were influenced by the democratic forms of his native country, which gave to the whole community the right of appointing the governing body. Calvin, independent of all such considerations, studied only how his doctrine could best be realised, whether through the instrumentality of existing authorities, or at their expense. In his eyes its interests were paramount, their promotion the supreme duty, opposition to them an unpardonable crime. There was nothing in the institutions of men, no authority, no right, no liberty, that he cared to preserve, or towards which he entertained any feelings of reverence or obligation.

His theory made the support of religious truth the end and office of the State,⁷⁷ which was bound therefore to protect, and consequently to obey, the Church, and had no control over it. In religion the first and highest thing was the dogma: the preservation of morals was one important office of government; but the maintenance of the purity of doctrine was the highest. The result of this theory is the institution of a pure theocracy. If the elect were alone upon the earth, Calvin taught, there would be no need of the political order, and the Anabaptists would be right in rejecting it;⁷⁸ but the elect are in a minority; and there is the mass of reprobates who must be coerced by the sword, in order

⁷⁶ Hundeshagen, *Conflikte des Zwinglianismus und Calvinismus*, 41.

⁷⁷ "Huc spectat (politia) . . . ne idololatria, ne in Dei nomen sacrilegia, ne adversus ejus veritatem blasphemiae aliaeque religionis offensiones publice emergant ac in populum spargantur. . . . Politicam ordinationem probō, quæ in hoc incumbit, ne vera religio, quæ Dei lege continetur, palam, publicisque sacrilegiis impune violetur" (*Institutio Christianæ Religionis*, ed. Tholuck, ii. 477). "Hoc ergo summopere requiritur a regibus, ut gladio quo præditi sunt utantur ad cultum Dei asserendum." *Prælectiones in Prophetas*,—*Opera*, v. 223, ed. 1667.

⁷⁸ "Huic etiam colligere promptum est, quam stulta fuerit imaginatio eorum qui volebant usum gladii tollere e mundo, Evangelii prætextu. Scimus Anabaptistas fuisse tumultuatos, quasi totus ordo politicus repugnaret Christi regno, quia regnum Christi continetur sola doctrina; deinde nulla futura sit vis. Illoc quidem verum esset, si essemus in hoc mundo angeli: sed quemadmodum jam dixi, exiguus est piorum numerus: ideo necesse est reliquam turbam cohiberi violento freno: quia permixti sunt filii Dei vel sævis belluis, vel vulpibus et fraudulentis hominibus" (*Pr. in Michæam*, v. 310). "In quo non suam modo inscitiam, sed diabolicum fastum produunt, dum perfectionem sibi arrogant, cujus ne centesima quidem pars in illis conspicitur." *Institutio*, ii. 478.

that all the world may be made subject to the truth, by the conquerors imposing their faith upon the vanquished.⁷⁹ He wished to extend religion by the sword, but to reserve death as the punishment of apostasy; and as this law would include the Catholics, who were in Calvin's eyes apostates from the truth, he narrowed it further to those who were apostates from the community. In this way, he said, there was no pretext given to the Catholics to retaliate.⁸⁰ They, as well as the Jews and Mohammedans, must be allowed to live: death was only the penalty of Protestants who relapsed into error; but to them it applied equally whether they were converted to the Church or joined the sects and fell into unbelief. Only in cases where there was no danger of his words being used against the Protestants, and in letters not intended for publication, he required that Catholics should suffer the same penalties as those who were guilty of sedition, on the ground that the majesty of God must be as strictly avenged as the throne of the king.⁸¹

If the defence of the truth was the purpose for which power was intrusted to princes, it was natural that it should be also the condition on which they held it. Long before the revolution of 1688, Calvin had decided that princes who deny the true faith, "abdicate" their crowns, and are no longer to be obeyed;⁸² and that no oaths are binding which are in contradiction to the interests of Protestantism.⁸³ He painted

⁷⁹ "Tota igitur excellentia, tota dignitas, tota potentia Ecclesiæ debet huc referri, ut omnia subiaceant Deo, et quicquid erit in gentibus hoc totum sit sacrum, ut scilicet cultus Dei tam apud victores quam apud victos vigeat." Pr. in Michæam, v. 317.

⁸⁰ "Ita tollitur offensio, quæ multos imperitos fallit, dum metuunt ne hoc prætextu ad sæviendum armentur Papæ carnifices." Calvin was warned by experience of the imprudence of Luther's language. "In Gallis proceres in excusanda sævitia immani, allegant auctoritatem Lutheri." Melancthon, Opera, v. 176.

⁸¹ "Vous avez deux espèces de mutins qui se sont eslevez entre le roy et l'estat du royaume: Les uns sont gens fantastiques, qui soubz couleur de l'évangile voudroient mettre tout en confusion. Les aultres sont gens obstinés aux superstitions de l'Antéchrist de Rome. Tous ensemble méritent bien d'estre réprimés par le clayve qui vous est commis, ven qu'ils s'attachent non-seulement au roy, mais à Dieu qui l'a assis au siège royal." Calvin to Somerset, 22d October 1548,—Lettres de Calvin, ed. Bonnet, i. 267. See also Henry, Leben Calvins, ii, append. 30.

⁸² "Abdicant enim se potestate terreni principes dum insurgunt contra Deum: imo indigni sunt qui censeantur in hominum numero. Potius ergo conspuere oportet in ipsorum capita, quam illis parere, ubi ita proterviunt ut velint etiam spoliare Deum jure suo, et quasi occupare solum ejus, acsi possent eum a celo detrahare." Pr. in Daniele, v. 91.

⁸³ "Quant au serment qu'on vous a contraincte de faire, comme vous avez failli et offensé Dieu en le faisant, aussi n'estes-vous tenue de le garder." Cal-

the princes of his age in the blackest colours,⁸⁴ and prayed to God for their destruction;⁸⁵ though at the same time he condemned all rebellion on the part of his friends, so long as there were great doubts of their success.^{85a} His principles, however, were often stronger than his exhortations, and he had difficulty in preventing murders and seditious movements in France.⁸⁶ When he was dead, nobody prevented them, and it became clear that his system, by subjecting the civil power to the service of religion, was more dangerous to toleration than Luther's plan of giving to the State supremacy over the Church.

Calvin was as positive as Luther in asserting the duty of obedience to rulers irrespective of their mode of government.⁸⁷ He constantly declared that tyranny was not to be

vin to the Duchess of Ferrara,—Bonnet, ii. 338. She had taken an oath, at her husband's death, that she would not correspond with Calvin.

⁸⁴ "In aulis regum videmus primas teneri a bestiis. Nam hodie, ne repetamus veteres historias, ut reges fere omnes fatui sunt ac bruti, ita etiam sunt quasi equi et asini brutorum animalium. . . . Reges sunt hodie fere mancipia" (Pr. in Daniele, v. 82). "Videmus enim ut hodie quoque pro sua libidine commoveant totum orbem principes: quia produunt alii aliis innoxios populos, et exercent fœdam nundinationem, dum quisque commodum suum venatur, et sine ullo pudore, tantum ut augeat suam potentiam, alios tradit in manum inimici" (Pr. in Nahum, v. 363). "Hodie pudet reges aliquid præ se ferre humanum, sed omnes gestus accommodant ad tyrannidem." Pr. in Jeremiam, v. 257.

⁸⁵ "Sur ce que je vous avais allégué, que David nous instruit par son exemple de haïr les ennemis de Dieu, vous respondes que c'estoit pour ce temps-là duquel sous la loi de rigueur il estoit permis de haïr les ennemis. Or, madame, ceste glose seroit pour renverser toute l'Ecriture, et partant il la fault fuir comme une peste mortelle. . . . Combien que j'aye toujours prié Dieu de luy faire mercy, si est-ce que j'ay souvent désiré que Dieu mist la main sur luy (Guise) pour en desliver son Eglise, s'il ne le vouloit convertir." Calvin to the Duchess of Ferrara,—Bonnet, ii. 551. Luther was in this respect equally unscrupulous: "This year we must pray Duke Maurice to death, we must kill him with our prayer; for he will be an evil man." Ms. quoted in Döllinger, Reformation, iii. 266.

^{85a} "Quod de præpostero nostrorum fervore scribis, verissimum est, neque tamen ulla occurrit moderandi ratio, quia sanis consiliis non obtemperant. Passim denuntio, si judex essem me non minus severe in rabiosos istos impetus vindicaturum, quam rex suis edictis mandat. Pergendum nihilominus, quando nos Deus voluit stultis esse debitores." Calvin to Beza,—Henry, Leben Calvins, iii. append. 164.

⁸⁶ "Il n'a tenu qu'à moi que, devant la guerre, gens de faict et d'exécution ne se soyent efforcés de l'exterminer du monde (Guise) lesquels ont esté retenus par ma seule exhortation." Bonnet, ii. 553.

⁸⁷ "Hoc nobis si assidue ob animos et oculos obversetur, eodem decreto constitui etiam nequissimos reges, quo regum auctoritas statuitur; nunquam in animum nobis seditiosæ illæ cogitationes venient, tractandum esse pro meritis regem nec æquum esse, ut subditos ei nos præstemus, qui vicissim regem nobis se non præstet. . . . De privatis hominibus semper loquor. Nam si qui nunc sint populares magistratus ad moderandam regum libidinem constituti (quales

resisted on political grounds ; that no civil rights could outweigh the divine sanction of government, except in cases where a special office was appointed for the purpose. Where there was no such office—where, for instance, the estates of the realm had lost their independence—there was no protection. This is one of the most important and essential characteristics of the politics of the reformers. By making the protection of their religion the principal business of government, they put out of sight its more immediate and universal duties, and made the political objects of the State disappear behind its religious end. A government was to be judged in their eyes only by its fidelity to the Protestant Church. If it fulfilled those requirements, no other complaints against it could be entertained. A tyrannical prince could not be resisted if he was orthodox ; a just prince could be dethroned if he failed in the more essential condition of faith. In this way Protestantism became favourable at once to despotism and to revolution, and was ever ready to sacrifice good government to its own interests. It subverted monarchies, and at the same time denounced those who, for political causes, sought their subversion ; but though the monarchies it subverted were sometimes tyrannical, and the seditions it prevented sometimes revolutionary, the order it defended or sought to establish was never legitimate and free, for it was always invested with the function of religious proselytism,⁸⁸ and with the obligation of removing every traditional, social, or political right or power which could oppose the discharge of that essential duty.

The part Calvin had taken in the death of Servetus obliged him to develop more fully his views on the punishment of heresy. He wrote a short account of the trial,⁸⁹ and

olim erant. . . . ephori. . . . tribuni. . . . demarchi : et qua etiam forte potestate, ut nunc res habent, funguntur in singulis regnis tres ordines, quum primarios conventus peragunt) . . . illos ferocienti regum licentiæ pro officio intercedere non veto." *Institutio*, ii. 493, 495.

⁸⁸ "Quum ergo ita licentiose omnia sibi permittunt (Donatistæ), volebant tamen impune manere sua scelera ; et in primis tenebant hoc principium : non esse pœnas sumendas, si quis ab aliis dissideret in religionis doctrina : quemadmodum hodie videmus quosdam de hac re nimis cupide contendere. Certum est quid cupiant. Nam si quis ipsos respiciat, sunt impii Dei contemptores : saltem vellent nihil certum esse in religione ; ideo labefactare, et quantum in se est etiam convellere nituntur omnia pietatis principia. Ut ergo liceat ipsis evomere virus suum, ideo tantopere litigant pro impunitate, et negant pœnas de hæreticis et blasphemis sumendas esse." *Pr. in Daniele*, v. 51.

⁸⁹ *Defensio Orthodoxæ Fidei* . . . ubi ostenditur Hæreticos jure gladii coercendos esse, 1554.

argued that governments are bound to suppress heresy, and that those who deny the justice of the punishment, themselves deserve it.⁹⁰ The book was signed by all the clergy of Geneva, as Calvin's compurgators. It was generally considered a failure; and a refutation appeared, which was so skilful as to produce a great sensation in the Protestant world.⁹¹ This famous tract, now of extreme rarity, did not, as has been said, "contain the pith of those arguments which have ultimately triumphed in almost every part of Europe;" nor did it preach an unconditional toleration.⁹² But it struck hard at Calvin by quoting a passage from the first edition of his *Institutes*, afterwards omitted, in which he spoke for toleration. "Some of those," says the author, "whom we quote have subsequently written in a different spirit. Nevertheless, we have cited the earlier opinion as the true one, as it was expressed under the pressure of persecution."⁹³ The first edition, we are informed by Calvin himself, was written for the purpose of vindicating the Protestants who were put to death, and of putting a stop to the

⁹⁰ "Non modo liberum esse magistratibus pœnas sumere de cœlestis doctrinæ corruptoribus, sed divinitus esse mandatum, ut pestiferis erroribus impunitatem dare nequeant, quin desciscant ab officii sui fide. . . . Nunc vero quisquis hæreticis et blasphemis injuste pœnam infligi contenderet, sciens et volens se obstringet blasphemix reatu. . . . Ubi a suis fundamentis convellitur religio, detestandæ in Deum blasphemix proferuntur, impiis et pestiferis dogmatibus in exitum rapiuntur animæ; denique ubi palam defectio ab unico Deo puraque doctrina tentatur, ad extremum illud remedium descendere necesse." See Schenkel, iii. 389; Dyer, *Life of Calvin*, 354; Henry, iii. 234.

⁹¹ De Hæreticis an sint persequendi: Magdeburgi, 1554. Chataillon, to whom it is generally attributed, was not the author. See Heppé, Theodor Beza, 37.

⁹² Hallam, *Literature of Europe*, ii. 81; Schlosser, *Leben des Beza*, 55. This is proved by the following passage from the dedication: "This I say not to favour the heretics, whom I abhor, but because there are here two dangerous rocks to be avoided. In the first place, that no man should be deemed a heretic when he is not . . . and that the real rebel be distinguished from the Christian who, by following the teaching and example of his Master, necessarily causes separation from the wicked and unbelieving. The other danger is, lest the real heretics be not more severely punished than the discipline of the Church requires." Baum, Theodor Beza, i. 215.

⁹³ "Multis piis hominibus in Gallia exustis grave passim apud Germanos odium ignes illi excitaverant, sparsi sunt, ejus restinguendi causa, improbi ac mendaces libelli, non alios tam crudeliter tractari, quam Anabaptistas ac turbulentos homines, qui perversis deliriis non religionem modo sed totum ordinem politicum convellerent. . . . Hæc mihi edendæ Institutionis causa fuit, primum ut ab injusta contumelia vindicarem fratres meos, quorum mors pretiosa erat in conspectu Domini; deinde quum multis miseris cadem visitarent supplicia, pro illis dolor saltem aliquis et sollicitudo exteras gentes tangeret." Præfatio in Psalmos. See *Historia Litteraria de Calvini Institutione*, in *Scrinium Antiquarium*, ii. 452.

persecution. It was anonymous, and naturally dwelt on the principles of toleration.

Although this book did not denounce all intolerance, and although it was extremely moderate, Calvin and his friends were filled with horror. "What remains of Christianity," exclaimed Beza, "if we silently admit what this man has expectorated in his preface? . . . Since the beginning of Christianity no such blasphemy was ever heard."⁹⁴ Beza undertook to defend Calvin in an elaborate work,⁹⁵ in which it was easy for him to cite the authority of all the leading reformers in favour of the practice of putting heretics to death, and in which he reproduced all the arguments of those who had written on the subject before him. More systematic than Calvin, he first of all excludes those who are not Christians, the Jews, Turks, and heathen, whom his inquiry does not touch; among Christians, he proceeds to say, some are schismatics, who sin against the peace of the Church, or disbelievers, who reject her doctrine. Among these, some err in all simplicity; and if their error is not very grave, and if they do not seduce others, they need not be punished.⁹⁶ But obstinate heretics are far worse than parricides, and deserve death, even if they repent.⁹⁷ It is the duty of the State to punish them, for the whole ecclesiastical order is upheld by the political.⁹⁸ In early ages this power was exercised by the temporal sovereigns; they convoked councils, punished heretics, promulgated dogmas.

⁹⁴ Baum, i. 206. "Telles gens," says Calvin, "seroient contents qu'il n'y eust ne loy, ne bride au monde. Voilà pourquoy ils ont basti ce beau livre *De non comburendis Hæreticis*, où ils ont falsifié les noms tant des villes que des personnes, non pour aultre cause sinon pource que le dit livre est farcy de blasphèmes insupportables." Bonnet, ii. 18.

⁹⁵ *De Hæreticis a civili Magistratu puniendis*, 1554.

⁹⁶ "Absit autem a nobis, ut in eos, qui vel simplicitate peccant, sine aliorum pernicie et insigni blasphemia, vel in explicando quopiam Scripturæ loco dissident a recepta opinione, magistratum armemus." *Tractatus Theologici*, i. 95.

⁹⁷ This was sometimes the practice in Catholic countries, where heresy was equivalent to treason. Duke William of Bavaria ordered obstinate Anabaptists to be burnt; those who recanted, to be beheaded. "Welcher revocir, den soll man köpfen; welcher nicht revocir, den soll man brennen." Jörg, 715.

⁹⁸ "Ex quibus omnibus una conjunctio efficitur, istos quibus hæretici videntur non esse puniendi, opinionem in Ecclesiam Dei conari longe omnium pestilentissimam invehere et ex diametro repugnantem doctrinæ primum a Deo Patre proditæ, deinde a Christo instauratæ, ab universa denique Ecclesia orthodoxa perpetuo consensu usurpatæ, ut mihi quidem magis absurde facere videantur quam si sacrilegas aut parricidas puniendos negarent, quum sint istis omnibus hæretici infinitis partibus deteriores." *Tract. Theol.* i. 143.

The Papacy afterwards arose, in evil times, and was a great calamity; but it was preferable a hundred times to the anarchy which was defended under the name of merciful toleration.

The circumstances of the condemnation of Servetus make it the most perfect and characteristic example of the abstract intolerance of the reformers. Servetus was guilty of no political crime; he was not an inhabitant of Geneva, and was on the point of leaving it, and nothing immoral could be attributed to him. He was not even an advocate of absolute toleration.⁹⁹ The occasion of his apprehension was a dispute between a Catholic and a Protestant, as to which party was most zealous in suppressing egregious errors. Calvin, who had long before declared that if Servetus came to Geneva, he should never leave it alive,¹⁰⁰ did all he could to obtain his condemnation by the Inquisition at Vienne. At Geneva he was anxious that the sentence should be death,¹⁰¹ and in this he was encouraged by the Swiss churches, but especially by Beza, Farel, Bullinger, and Peter Martyr.¹⁰²

⁹⁹ "Verum est quod correctione non exspectata Ananiam et Sapphiram occidit Petrus. Quia Spiritus Sanctus tunc maxime vicens, quem spreverant, docebat esse incorrigibiles, in malitia obstinatos. Hoc crimen est morte simpliciter dignum et apud Deum et apud homines. In aliis autem criminibus, ubi Spiritus Sanctus speciale quid non docet, ubi non est inveterata malitia, aut obstinatio certa non apparet aut atrocitas magna, correctionem per alias castigationes sperare potius debemus." Servetus, *Restitutio Christianismi*, 656; Henry, iii. 235.

¹⁰⁰ "Namsi venerit, modo valeat mea autoritas, vivum exire nunquam patiari." Calvin to Farel, in Henry, iii., append. 65. Audin, *Vie de Calvin*, ii. 314. Dyer, 544.

¹⁰¹ "Spero capitale saltem fore judicium: pœnæ vero atrocitatem remitti cupio" (Calvin to Farel,—Henry, iii. 189). Dr. Henry makes no attempt to clear Calvin of the imputation of having caused the death of Servetus. Nevertheless he proposed, some years later, that the three-hundredth anniversary of the execution should be celebrated in the Church of Geneva by a demonstration. "It ought to declare itself in a body, in a manner worthy of our principles, admitting that in past times the authorities of Geneva were mistaken, loudly proclaiming toleration, which is truly the crown of our Church, and paying due honour to Calvin, because he had no hand in the business (parcequ'il n'a pas trempé dans cette affaire), of which he has unjustly borne the whole burden." The impudence of this declaration is surpassed by the editor of the French periodical from which we extract it. He appends to the words in our parenthesis the following note: "We underline in order to call attention to this opinion of Dr. Henry, who is so thoroughly acquainted with the whole question." *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français*, ii. 114.

¹⁰² "Qui scripserunt de non plectendis hæreticis, semper mihi visi sunt non parum errare" (Farel to Blaarer,—Henry, iii. 202). During the trial he wrote to Calvin: "If you desire to diminish the horrible punishment, you will act as a friend towards your most dangerous enemy. If I were to seduce any body from the true faith, I should consider myself worthy of death; I

All the Protestant authorities, therefore, agreed in the justice of putting a writer to death in whose case all the secondary motives of intolerance were wanting. Servetus was not a party-leader. He had no followers, who threatened to upset the peace and unity of the Church. His doctrine was speculative, without power or attraction for the masses, like Lutheranism; and without consequences subversive of morality, or affecting in any direct way the existence of society, like Anabaptism.¹⁰³ He had nothing to do with Geneva, and his persecutors would have rejoiced if he had been put to death elsewhere. "Bayle," says Hallam,¹⁰⁴ "has an excellent remark on this controversy." Bayle's remark is as follows: "Whenever Protestants complain, they are answered by the right which Calvin and Beza recognised in magistrates; and to this day there has been nobody who has not failed pitiably against this *argumentum ad hominem*."

No question of the merits of the Reformation, or of persecution, is involved in an inquiry as to the source and connexion of the opinions on toleration held by the Protestant reformers. No man's sentiments on the rightfulness of religious persecution will be affected by the theories we have described, and they have no bearing whatever on doctrinal controversy. Those who, in agreement with the principle of the early Church, that men are free in matters of conscience,

cannot judge differently of another than of myself." Schmidt, Farel and Viret, 33.

Before sentence was pronounced, Bullinger wrote to Beza: "*Quid vero amplissimus Senatus Genevensis ageret cum blasphemio illo nebulone Serveto. Si sapit et officium suum facit, cædit, ut totus orbis videat Genevam Christi gloriam cupere servatam*" (Baum, i. 204). With reference to Socinus, he wrote: "*Sentio ego spirituali gladio abscindendos esse homines hæreticos*." Henry, iii. 225.

Peter Martyr Vermili also gave in his adhesion to Calvin's policy: "*De Serveto Hispano, quid aliud dicam non habeo, nisi eum fuisse genuinum Diaboli filium, cujus pestifera et detestanda doctrina, undique profliganda est, neque magistratus, qui de illo supplicium extremum sumpsit, accusandus est, cum emendationis nulla indicia in eo possent deprehendi, illiusque blasphemie omnino intolerabiles essent*." *Loci Communes*, 1114. See Schlosser, *Leben des Beza und des Peter Martyr Vermili*, 512.

Zanchi, who at the instigation of Bullinger also published a treatise *De Hæreticis coercendis*, says of Beza's work: "*Non poterit non probari summopere piis omnibus. Satis superque respondit quidem ille novis istis academiceis, ita ut supervacanea et inutilis omnino videatur mea tractatio*." Baum, i. 232.

¹⁰³ "The trial of Servetus," says a very ardent Calvinist, "is illegal only in one point: the crime, if crime there be, had not been committed at Geneva; but long before the Councils had usurped the unjust privilege of judging strangers stopping at Geneva, although the crimes they were accused of had not been committed there." Haag, *La France Protestante*, iii. 129.

¹⁰⁴ *Literature of Europe*, ii. 82.

condemn all intolerance, will censure Catholics and Protestants alike. Those who pursue the same principle one step farther, and practically invert it, by insisting on the right and duty not only of professing, but of extending the truth, must, as it seems to us, approve the conduct both of Protestants and Catholics; unless they make the justice of the persecution depend on the truth of the doctrine defended, in which case they will divide on both sides. Such persons, again, as are more strongly impressed with the cruelty of actual executions than with the danger of false theories, may concentrate their indignation on the Catholics of Languedoc and Spain; while those who judge principles, not by the accidental details attending their practical realisation, but by the reasoning on which they are founded, will arrive at a verdict adverse to the Protestants. These comparative inquiries, however, have little serious interest. If we give our admiration to tolerance, we must remember that the Spanish Moors, and the Turks in Europe, have been more tolerant than the Christians; and if we admit the principle of intolerance, and judge its application by particular conditions, we are bound to acknowledge that the Romans had better reason for persecution than any modern State, since their empire was involved in the decline of the old religion with which it was bound up, whereas no Christian policy has been subverted by the mere presence of religious dissent. The comparison is moreover entirely unreasonable; for there is nothing in common between Catholic and Protestant intolerance. The Church began with the principle of liberty, both as her claim and as her rule; and external circumstances forced intolerance upon her, after her spirit of unity had triumphed, in spite both of the freedom she proclaimed and of the persecution she suffered. Protestantism set up intolerance as an imperative precept, and as a part of its doctrine; and it was forced to admit toleration by the necessities of its position, after the rigorous penalties it imposed had failed to arrest the process of internal dissolution.¹⁰⁵

At the time when this involuntary change occurred, the sects that caused it were the bitterest enemies of the toleration they demanded. In the same age, the Puritans and the

¹⁰⁵ This is the ground taken by two Dutch divines in answer to the consultation of John of Nassau, in 1579: "*Neque in imperio, neque in Galliis, neque in Belgio speranda esset unquam libertas in externo religionis exercitio nostris . . . si non diversarum religionum exercitia in una eademque provincia toleranda. . . . Sic igitur gladio adversus nos armabimus Pontificios, si hanc hypothesin tuebimur, quod exercitium religionis alteri parti nullum prorsus relinqui debeat.*" *Scrinium Antiquarium*, i. 335.

Catholics sought a refuge beyond the Atlantic from the persecution which they suffered together under the Stuarts. Flying for the same reason, and from the same oppression, they were enabled respectively to carry out their own views in the colonies which they founded in Massachusetts and Maryland; and the history of those two States exhibits faithfully the contrast between the two Churches. The Catholic emigrants established, for the first time in modern history, a government in which religion was free, and with it the germ of that religious liberty which now prevails in America. The Puritans, on the other hand, revived with greater severity the penal laws of the mother country. In process of time, the liberty of conscience in the Catholic colony was forcibly abolished by the neighbouring Protestants of Virginia; while on the borders of Massachusetts the new State of Rhode Island was formed by a party of fugitives from the intolerance of their fellow-colonists.

Communicated Articles.

MARSHALL ON CHRISTIAN MISSIONS.*

MR. MARSHALL'S comparative History of Missions will completely justify the expectations which he raised by his specimen volume on China. The unction and liveliness which there delighted his readers have not deserted him, and his style is equally happy, whether he has to edify us with the self-sacrifice of the Catholic missionaries, or to amuse us with the misadventures of their rivals. And he is happier, if possible, in his subject than in his style, for he has chosen an argument, important and yet new,—new in its unity and totality, however familiar it may be in its parts. His subject may be called the complement of that of the first portion of Dr. Döllinger's late book, which traces the developments of Protestantism in the civilised races of Europe, while Mr. Marshall traces its developments among the half-civilised and barbarous races of the other quarters of the earth. These two divisions exhaust the subject; and there is no doubt that a comprehensive survey of both, honestly made, would have the happiest effect upon those persons, "neither frankly Protestant nor effectually Catholic," who only compare themselves with themselves,† and refuse to look beyond the limits of their own coterie or their own parish, and to take a comprehensive survey of the action of their community upon the world. Such persons may learn a great deal from Mr. Marshall's volumes, unless he has laboured in vain. But if those, for whom he chiefly wrote, to whom his arguments are addressed, and who explain the whole purpose of his volumes, refuse to hear him, the results of his admirable industry will not be lost; he will be read with edification and delight by numbers of Catholics, who will appreciate both his purpose and his style.

The subject is one that "has led" the writer "out of the region of speculative controversy into that of historical facts;" not that his business has been that of the historian; his work is not a history, but, as he calls it, a review of a history; a collection of opinions, judgments, and results, rather than a development of these results from their causes. It is necessary to bear this in mind, or we should perhaps expect more from the book than we shall find in it. The

* Christian Missions: their Agents, their Method, and their Results. By T. W. M. Marshall. 3 vols. Burns and Lambert.

† Vol. iii. p. 468.

author never proposes to seek for the reasons why missions of the same kind fail here, and are fruitful there ; why converts of one race are tenacious of the faith, while other races quickly relapse ; and the like questions which occur at each page. His one argument, the same through the three volumes, patiently carried on in spite of its monotony, is this—"Apostolic success is the test of Christian truth—'by their fruits ye shall know them.' The universal experience of the day is, that Catholic missions to the heathen have every where succeeded, Protestant missions uniformly failed. Therefore the Catholic religion is Christian truth, and Protestantism is not so."

The argument is certainly a happy one. It concerns one of those living characteristics of the living Church which are manifest to all eyes. It is rather a token than an argument—a sign than a syllogism ; it is addressed, not to a reasoning faculty which few have cultivated, but to a seeing faculty, which the peasant has as perfectly as the philosopher. It is as simple as St. Augustine's famous note,—*tenet me in Ecclesie gremio ipsum Catholicæ nomen*,—"the very name Catholic, which no sect can usurp, and which none finds it possible to deny to the Church, keeps me in her bosom." It is like that other token, "that Church can alone be the infallible Church which alone refuses to admit its fallibility." And all three rest on this ground, that God Almighty, by some mysterious influence, compels sects to renounce the name Catholic for themselves, and to give it to the Church ; to renounce the claim of infallibility for themselves, though they deny it to the Church also ; and to expend treasures and toil in a manifestly fruitless attempt to convert the heathen, while they allow that the Church, with a mere fraction of the cost in money, does many thousand times as much.

Still it must be owned that Mr. Marshall's argument, however useful, is not so absolute as the others, because it requires a preliminary discussion of matters which he has omitted to consider. He who makes success in converting the heathen the test of religious truth, has to explain the successes of Brahminism, Buddhism, and Islamism, the great missionary religions of the East. The multitudes they converted were enormous, and the tenacity of their converts has been astonishing ; no Christian missions have as yet had an equal numerical success ; yet in none of the three gentile systems was the doctrine true, or its apostles called by God to their work.

And if the argument is to be restricted to Christian

missions, and all other missionary successes are to be (somewhat arbitrarily) excluded, still it requires due allowance to be made for the early successes of Nestorian missionaries, who converted Central and Eastern Asia up to the middle of China ; of Arian missionaries, who converted the Goths and Vandals, and other Teutonic nations ; and of the orthodox Greeks, who, since the schism, however sterile they may be now, have converted many of the Slavonic populations.

These examples would show that there are other possible elements and causes of missionary success besides the truth of the doctrine preached, and the divine vocation of the apostle who preaches it. The first element of such success is asceticism ; and at various periods in history the false diabolical asceticism of pagan religions has been as efficacious in missionary results as the true asceticism of Christianity. Those races which have not been transformed in the Medean caldron of modern European civilisation have at the bottom of their souls an obscure feeling which tells them that religion is a corporeally painful sacrifice. The feast and orgies may come after the sacrifice ; but first comes the starvation, the flagellation, the cutting with knives, the mutilation. Their hearts bend before the preacher whom they see doing severe penances, and inflicting upon himself cruel disciplines. Without the forms of asceticism, there is no means of converting these men. Religion must be preached to them as religion, not as civilisation ; as severity, not as comfort. There may be ambition in the teacher, but none of those civilised appliances which, however poor, must look like luxury to the savage. The road of asceticism is the only way to prepare the barbarian for civilisation. Only religious severity or slavery could relieve his squalor by teaching him to labour for the means of life ; and could fix his habits and utilise his powers by making him obedient to an intellect higher than his own.

But to do this, the preacher must be faithful to the ascetic ideal of descending in all matters but those connected with religion to the level of the savage whom he teaches, just as St. Francis adopted the habits and the way of life of the poor serfs around him. The apostolic missionary first received in the cœnacle the tongues of the nations he was to convert, that he might address them in their own jargon, and teach them by means of the rude ideas and images with which they were familiar. He brought them no new mode of life or thought ; he only wanted to touch the soul. He did not carry to them a Gospel of riches, health, or power ; he had no distinctive civilisation to bring them in lieu of

their own ; but he took with him a religion that was compatible with every civilisation, that neither disdained the most imperfect nor gaped in admiration at the most perfect, and that was Catholic because it could coexist with every possible human condition. The savage Galla might remain a savage Galla, and yet become as good a Christian as the most holy prelate in Europe. So now, the Catholic missionary accommodates himself to every thing, even to the rudest hut ; and if he any where finds a savage too stupid to build a hut, he will go out to him, and sit by him under his tree or in his cave, and patiently teach him, not to build huts and weave cloth to clothe himself, but to believe in, to hope in, and to love the God of the Christians. So universal an application does the Catholic missionary give to the precept of St. Paul to the new converts—*Unusquisque in quâ vocatione vocatus est, in eâ permaneat apud Deum.*

And if asceticism in the missionary is necessary to make his message probable in the eyes of the barbarians to whom he preaches, it is equally necessary to the missionary himself, to keep him up to his vocation, to preserve his spiritual superiority, and to prevent his sinking to the level of the barbarians, with whom he has cast his lot. It has been said by a great philosopher, that "asceticism is a solitary and celestial civilisation of the individual," a refuge against "the savage life of corrupt society;" and therefore the proper correlative and corrective of barbarism. It is simple, independent, self-centred, self-reliant, unbending to external influences, but at the same time stoically tolerant of them. The civilisation of society, on the contrary, is a composite thing, which makes the members of society mutually dependent on each other, and tends to destroy the stoical independence which characterises the ascetic. It is obliged to be intolerant of the contact and intermixture of barbarism. When it transports itself to a barbarous country, it must either hold itself high and aloof from the native population, or if it allows them to mingle with it, it must gradually sink nearly to their level. The only kind of civilisation that can afford to isolate itself from its kindred and people, and to sojourn among barbarians, admitting them to familiar intercourse without being defiled by them, is the ascetic or individual civilisation.

Some nations have more aptitude for an individual civilisation, having something in common with asceticism ; some for a social civilisation. The English, who have carried the latter to the highest development yet known, are a by-word among races of less political, but greater individual, culture

for their abject dependence on their own social systems. We laugh at the political despotism which other races endure. They reply, "You may talk of the despotism of Nero and Tiberius; but the real tyranny is the tyranny of your next-door neighbour. What law is so cruel as the law of doing what he does? What yoke so galling as the necessity of being like him? What espionage of despotism comes to your door so effectually as the eye of the man who lives at your door? Public opinion is a fermenting influence, and it exacts obedience to itself; it requires us to think other men's thoughts, to speak other men's words, and to follow other men's habits." The individualism of other races is a cause of the anarchy into which they naturally run, and for which the only remedy is despotism. Take one of the gay atoms out of the unorganised society of France, and place him amidst barbarians; he is almost as much at home there as in his own land. Tocqueville enlarges upon the ease with which the lively Frenchman adapts himself to the manners of the wild Indian in Canada, where he lives in one of the huts of the tribe like a brother; while the unbending Englishman keeps the savages at a distance, and jealously surrounds himself in the wilderness with every appliance and every institution of civilisation that he can carry with him. The civilisation of the Frenchman is vague, individual, adaptable to any circumstances, but soon swallowed up and assimilated by the race into which he throws himself. The civilisation of the Englishman is weak in the individual, but strong in the mass. It depends on unity with its original source. It admits of no compromise, no change which would cut it off from society at home. Hence it is concentrated, narrow, harsh, intolerant. The Englishman is conscious that his strength consists not in himself, but in the society of which he forms a part, and therefore he will never willingly put off his national character. He emigrates to conquer, to rule, to transform, or to destroy; not to descend to the level of the race that he conquers, and to make a compromise between its civilisation and his own. A conquering race which bears its own civilisation thus indelibly marked upon it, can never have the true missionary genius which wins inferior races. Who ever heard of conversions by Greek and Roman missionaries in the palmy days of Greek and Roman greatness? Similarly, nature, which has given in these days political greatness to the English, has at the same time denied them the genius of the missionary. The French have it; but at the same time, as a nation, they are exhibiting to the world a wonderful instance of thorough political incapacity.

Hence, even in natural character, the Frenchman is more fit for solitary missionary enterprise than the Englishman. The Frenchman goes out without any resources but those which he carries within him; the English missionary tries to take with him his national civilisation. This is true of the English and Irish priest in India and Australia, as well as of the Protestant missionary. The latter, however, exaggerates the peculiarity of his nation; he goes out with security for his salary, for a comfortable home, for the society of his countrymen,—with wife, and servants, and pianoforte. All this is necessary for him, for without it he would be degrading himself to the level of the society he goes to convert. But at the same time it is destructive of his mission; for it is not only a token of his hostility to that asceticism which, to unsophisticated nature, lies at the root of religion, but is also a sign that he comes to preach not merely a new religion, but an alien civilisation also—that he comes to change not only morals and belief, but customs and manners—that the religion which he offers is not one which the Indian or savage can receive, and remain Indian or savage; but one which is to transform him into a European, into a superficial resemblance of the missionary who preaches to him. But this is what inferior races most obstinately resist. The hatred of the Celtic peasantry of France for that Germanic civilisation which marks the traditional Frankish rule is a faint example of the sullen scorn with which the savage refuses to accept the ideas of the civilised races of mankind.

The Protestant missionary, then, cannot convert to his religion, for he lacks the great token of asceticism. Nor can he force the barbarian to accept his civilisation; this can only be done by conquest and subsequent intermarriage. There only remains the influence of his example; and his example recommends a civilisation which is a state of artificial luxury and enjoyment, only adapted for people who have by a long education been prepared for it, and is deadly as opium or brandy to the reckless savage. Slavery would be better for him than such a fatal gift, for slavery would teach him habits of civilisation and order; but the civilised routine of the missionary teaches no lesson of labour, of self-denial, or sacrifice. It allows the savage to keep his listless ways, but covers over the void with a ragged mantle of self-indulgence and hypocrisy, and thus deprives him of his rude virtues without giving him any better ones in exchange. The Protestant missionary cannot be an ascetic, it is contrary both to his religion and to his civilisation. Neither can he condescend, like the apostolic missionary, to the degraded

beings to whom he preaches. Such condescension, without the safeguard of asceticism, would only degrade him to their moral level.

Mr. Marshall, then, is mistaken in supposing that the failure of English, American, and German Protestant missionaries to convert the barbarous or half-barbarous pagans is simply a token of the falsity of the religion they preach. Other causes, even more than their heresy, produce this result. Another mistake is, his quarrel with the English Government in India for deriving a revenue from administering the property of the temples.* He may answer, that he only echoes the reproaches which Exeter Hall itself utters, and that it is not his business to defend a Protestant government from the charges of its own friends. But the cause of truth requires us to be rather more nice in the selection of our weapons. Surely, to tax the pilgrims of Juggernaut, and to get 17,000*l.* a year out of the administration of temple property in Madras, is, of the two, rather a discouragement than an encouragement of idolatry. To tax idols is not putting a premium upon their worship, but to exempt them from taxation might be. If the government may tolerate idolatry, it may also see that the temple property is duly administered, and that peace is kept at the temple feasts. A Catholic government would deserve no reproach for sending policemen to keep order at a Methodist revival, or Mormon preaching. It would be abominable to go out of the way to honour, to propagate, or to preserve heathen ceremonies, but on any thing short of this it is difficult to fasten blame. Toleration implies the protection of the liberty of that which is tolerated. The question on which all depends is, whether idolatrous rites are to be tolerated in India; and in answering this question Mr. Marshall would have found St. Thomas not only a safer but a more liberal guide than either Mr. Close or Mr. Peggs. "Man's government," says St. Thomas, "is derived from God's, and ought to imitate it. But God, almighty and all-good as He is, permits certain evils in the world which He might prohibit, lest in preventing them, He should prevent greater good, or even cause worse evils. So human rulers are right in tolerating some evils, lest some good should be prevented, or some worse evils incurred; as St. Augustine says, *Aufer meretrices de rebus humanis, turbaveris omnia libidinibus*. So, though infidels commit sin in their rites, they may be tolerated, either for some good which accrues from them, or some evil which is avoided. . . . For this cause the Church has some-

* Vol. I. pp. 417-421.

times tolerated even the rites of heretics and *heathens*, when the multitude of unbelievers has been great.* The analogy suggested by St. Augustine of the toleration of places of vicious resort might have taught Mr. Marshall to be more cautious. The captious criticism of the forerunners of our Exeter-Hall worthies upon the management of such places by the Roman government, ought to have made him refrain from an equally groundless criticism of the English government for a perfectly analogous policy in India.

But Mr. Marshall's eyes have been fixed too firmly on the matter he has undertaken to describe, to allow him to divert his attention to analogies, or other collateral topics. The subject is one which required in its historian an immense fund of general historical knowledge. To this Mr. Marshall cannot pretend. Hence he should have been more careful not to assert as true, things which he can only have hoped, but cannot have known, to be so. The second paragraph in his book could not have been written if he had been aware that, at least as late as 1847, it was forbidden, under pain of excommunication, to attempt the conversion of a Mahometan in Syria. There was abundant political reason for this. Perhaps a fair inquiry might have satisfied Mr. Marshall that there were also political reasons to be alleged for the similar facts which he reprobates as unexampled atrocities. We fear also that it will be pronounced to be an unpardonable fault in a comparative historian of Catholic and Protestant missions, to have omitted all mention of the quarrel between Dominicans and Jesuits in his account of the China mission; and to have contented himself with the barest allusion to the Goa schism in his account of the missions of India and Ceylon.

It would have been better also if he had been satisfied with letting facts speak for themselves, without going out of his way to declare that the special mission of England is to make the conversion of the heathen impossible, and to threaten her with speedy vengeance and collapse in consequence. In his anxiety to contrast our ill-treatment of the aborigines of the countries we have colonised with the gentleness of Catholic colonists, he allows nothing for different circumstances; indeed he assumes them to be alike, and thence concludes that the difference of treatment results purely from the difference of religion. A French Catholic writer might have taught him to be more equitable in assigning the causes for the extirpation of the Indians from British America, and their increase in Spanish America.

* S. Thos. Sum. 2da 2dæ, q. 10. art. 11.

These tribes, says M. Gobineau, see beside them a great and increasing race, whose ships float by thousands on all their seas and rivers. They know that the strength of their masters is irresistible. They have no hope of ever seeing their country cleared of the intruders. They know that their continent is destined to belong to the Europeans. "They have only to open their eyes to be convinced of the vigour of that foreign civilisation which offers a more certain support to life than the chances of the chase or of the fishery. When they buy their brandy, their clothes, their guns, they know that even their gross tastes may be better satisfied in the new system than in their own. It invites them, it begs them to approach, it bribes them and flatters them, to induce them to come in; but they refuse; they prefer to retreat from wilderness to wilderness; they bury themselves deeper and deeper in their forests. They leave every thing, even the graves of their fathers. They know that they are doomed; but a mysterious repugnance keeps them aloof; and, with all their wonder at the strength of the white race, their mind, their nature, and their blood revolt at the idea of community with it.

"In Spanish America, people fancy there is less aversion of the natives for the Europeans. It is because the home government left them from the first under their own rulers. It never tried to civilise them. It allowed them to keep their customs and laws, and, provided they were Christians, only asked them for tribute. It did not colonise. When the conquest was once made, it resigned itself to an indolent toleration, and its only oppression was by fits and starts. Thus the Indians of Spanish America are less miserable, and are allowed to live, while the neighbours of the English will perish without mercy."

There is no doubt that the first striking difference between the Spanish and English colonies is this,—that the Spaniards undertook to discharge towards the natives the duties which higher religion and civilisation imposed upon them, whilst the English quietly ignored the natives altogether. Undoubtedly the first cause of this is the fact that the Church was a link to unite Spaniards and natives, and that this link was wanting in the English colonies. This is a glory for the Church, and, as far as it goes, an evidence of her sanctity and truth.

But there are secondary physical and political reasons for the difference between the two sets of colonies, which prevent it from being as absolute a criterion of the two religions as Mr. Marshall desires to make it. For instance,

within the tropics, labour is hateful and deadly to Europeans. In cold and temperate climates, it is a pleasure and a healthy exercise. The Spaniards in the south needed the natives to work for them. The English in the north worked for themselves; but as they proceeded southwards, they also had to provide themselves with a race of labourers accustomed to the hot sun. And here they were less fortunate than the Spaniards. The natives of English America lived by the chase, and could not be brought to cultivate the soil. In Spanish America, the natives had many fixed agricultural settlements. The English could not utilise the natives around them; the Spanish found in their neighbours exactly what they wanted.

Again, it is a fact in politics, that colonising governments use the aborigines well, while private adventurers ill-treat them. Now the English colonies were generally founded by emigrants, who had nothing whatever to do with the home government. They were generally sectarians, exclusive in their religion, flying from the persecution of penal laws, and not members of a great Catholic religious organisation. In both respects the Spaniards were entirely different. The Spanish colonist went forth as a servant and emissary of the State; he worked for it, and under its guidance and control, and at the same time as a working member of a Church which had the same duties towards the natives as towards the colonist. Thus the Spanish American was under a double control of general laws, from which the English American was entirely free.

The English colonists set up for themselves; they emigrated to insure freedom from control, not to be agents of a home government. And the home government could only exercise a precarious and imperfect control over them. But now, where a people is divided into classes, one subject to another, a strong supreme power is necessary as much for Catholics as for Protestants and Pagans, to watch the masters and to protect the slave; and thus to preserve both for the interests of the State. And, indeed, it is only this subordination of classes that makes a strong despotic government possible. For the relation of the masters to the slaves is a compensation to the master which makes him tolerant of the oppression exercised over himself by the government; while to the slave it appears either as a protection against his master, or at least as tending to make the master a protection to the slave against the oppression of the government. For this reason, absolute monarchy delights in castes, in the modification of citizenship according to dis-

inctions of blood, white, black, or blue, and in slavery, which, even when there is no monarchy, tends to make the state absolute, and causes its absolutism to be a blessing. The terror which the Frankish part of French society has for the socialism of the Gallic classes, and the envy of the latter against the former, make both classes tolerant of the despotism of their government.

English colonisation was a social movement, carried on in defiance of the government, to escape religious oppression, civil troubles, or the miseries of too numerous a population. But the Spanish colonists had the best possible reasons to remain at home. No man left home intending to die out of Spain. The whole colonisation had to be organised by the public authority, or it would never have taken place. This gave it a political character. It was the superabundant force of Spain that sent forth its colonies. But it was the weakness, the sickness of England, in the time of her greatest ignominy under the Stuart rule, that cast forth her children to shift for themselves. Therefore the English colonists did shift for themselves, because they had only themselves to rely on; and they naturally flourished and grew up to a vigorous independence.

But the Spanish colonies were always of hot-house growth; they dwindled as the fires went out in the stoves; they declined with the decline of the mother country; and when they were violently separated from her, they showed that they had no vitality in them.

If the English government had colonised, it would have dealt with the natives as gently as the Spanish government did. It would have followed Bacon's advice, who said, that colonists should be planted "in a pure soil, where people are not displanted to the end to plant in others; for else it is rather an extirpation than a plantation;" or, "if you plant where savages are, . . . use them justly and graciously, with sufficient guard nevertheless; and do not win their favour by helping them to invade their enemies. . . . And send off of them over to the country that plants, that they may see a better condition than their own, and commend it when they return" (*Essay on Plantation*). And in a paper of advice to George Villiers, then prime minister, after laying down rules for colonisation by the government, Bacon adds, among his cautions—"to make no extirpation of the natives under pretence of planting religion; God surely will no way be pleased with such sacrifices." In that day our forefathers thought their own hands clean in this matter, and professed a great horror of the Spaniards' cruelty. For, in truth, the

Spanish adventurers were as bad as the English have proved themselves to be. But the strong hand of the Spanish government restrained the one, while the English government was too feeble and too hated to influence the others.

Another defect that struck me in reading Mr. Marshall's book, is that, in spite of the excellence and liveliness of his style, the length of his work gives it a certain monotony, which is not lessened by his failure to discriminate between the various races brought under missionary influence. Chinese, New Zealander, and American Indian, are all the same to him; the only thing he attends to is the various success of the missions. He sacrifices all the life which he might easily have given his book by a better appreciation of the different national characters.

In other respects, his eloquence and rhetoric have led him astray. It does not suit the historian to be a controversialist. He should be a critic, not a polemic. For a polemic has a purpose; he fights for an idea; and ideas are more apt to lead than to follow, even when such stubborn things as facts have to be dealt with. Moreover, though the facts he describes are enough to make him angry, he should not give the reins to his anger. *Facit indignatio versus*: indignation may pour itself out in sounding periods, but it is not a kind of thing that gives a man power or right to mount the prophet's chair, and to declare what is about to happen. Whenever Mr. Marshall is much moved, he is apt to become prophetic. Throughout the volumes, I find mutterings of a coming retribution; but towards the end (vol. iii. p. 494) the writer tells us plainly, with an assurance worthy of Dr. Cumming, that we have arrived "at the eve of that reign of Antichrist, of which the events of the sixteenth century were the dismal presage, and of which the phenomena of our own are the certain harbinger." An absorbing idea like this, imported from without into history, and not a mere interpretation of facts by experience, is so anti-historical, that I doubt whether a mind under its fascination can investigate facts without bias, or record them without conscious purpose.

This criticism applies only partially to one who does not pretend to be a historian, but only a reviewer, or advocate of a particular historical view. Mr. Marshall's argument, though not so absolute as he imagines, is a very important one, and will be more important when dispassionately discussed. The object at present is to popularise the argument, and not to work it out scientifically. This justifies his one-sidedness, and enables me to say that he has exhibited judg-

ment and prudence in writing a book which enthusiasts will delight in, instead of one addressed, if to cooler heads, perhaps also to colder hearts.

Mr. Marshall begins with comparing the means used respectively by Catholics and Protestants, in order to bring Christianity home to the minds and consciences of the heathen. The Catholic missionaries make use of personal intercourse, and the example of a life of self-sacrifice and asceticism, often ended by martyrdom. The Protestant missionaries chiefly depend upon the influence of printed books and tracts, on which the societies spend incredible sums. But as the Protestant missionaries have hitherto chiefly come from an uneducated class, and have been brought up at second-rate Dissenting colleges, where probably the best Latin or Greek exercise would deserve a *pluck* at Oxford or Cambridge, it is not to be expected that they have succeeded in their translations of Scripture and edifying tracts into the literary languages of the East, or into the barbarous jargons of savage tribes. In the latter case the versions are often perfectly unintelligible; in the other, unendurably illiterate and vulgar. By a very easy transition, in one Eastern version the text, "Judge not, that ye be not judged," is transformed into, "Do no justice, that no justice be done unto you." The Chinese or Brahmin literate, who reckons some of the compositions of the old Jesuit missionaries among the classics of his language, cannot be persuaded to read a page of the clumsy compositions of their Protestant rivals.

After his chapter on the "Bible and the Heathen," Mr. Marshall gives parallel and contrasted histories of the Catholic and Protestant missions in China, India, Ceylon, the Antipodes, Oceanica, Africa, the Levant, and America. His histories of the Catholic missions are chiefly biographical, and are compiled mostly from Catholic sources, but checked by Protestant accounts. His stories of Protestant missions are almost entirely made up of passages culled from Protestant writers. His volumes close with a summary of the results of his inquiries.

Mr. Marshall repeatedly acknowledges the generosity of the Protestant laity, who are discouraged by no failures from throwing away millions after millions of money, in the vain but sincere hope of purchasing the services of those who may have the vocation and the ability to spread the Protestant faith among the heathen. In fact, the generosity of Exeter Hall is a lesson we should do well to learn. We can triumph over the missionary societies of Protestants,

not because we can compete with their lavish liberality, but because the gift of a true missionary vocation is not to be found among them. If they had our missionaries, they would provide for their support much more largely than we do, even in proportion to our means.

This consideration applies to Catholics throughout Europe, but more especially to English Catholics. It is somewhat humiliating to compare the amount which we contribute to the funds of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, with the amount which we receive from those funds.

Mr. Marshall teaches us how cheaply successful missions to barbarians are maintained; our own experience shows us how expensive, in proportion to their numerical results, are missions in European countries. With these lessons in one's memory, it is not pleasant to find to what an extent our English missions belong to the pauper class; to the class of those which are maintained on charity, not to those which give generously; to those which consume much, and thrive little, not to those which thrive much, and consume little. The Church in England and Scotland, and, to some degree, in Ireland, is a mendicant Church; it lives, to a certain extent, on the alms of the Church in other lands. Out of the total receipts of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith in 1860, which were 4,547,399 francs, England, Scotland, and Ireland received among them 444,700 francs; our European colonies, 35,000; our East-Indian possessions, 423,000; our African colonies, 61,500; our American colonies, 343,000; besides what was spent upon our kinsmen in the United States, and upon our Islands in the Pacific. Thus the sum of 1,307,200 francs,—nearer one-third than a quarter of the whole,—were spent upon us and upon our fellow subjects. The average sum collected by the Society (from 1856 to 1860 inclusive) is 4,917,700 francs, or 196,700*l.* a year. Of this, France contributes, on the average, 3,052,010 francs, or 122,000*l.*; while England gives 40,280 francs, or 1611*l.* England alone consumes on an average 212,240 francs, or 8490*l.* a year; and as this sum varies in proportion to the amount we contribute, the figures prove how well it pays us to be liberal. Thus self-interest and generous shame unite to urge us to make some stronger exertions to rival the liberality of our Protestant countrymen, and to respond to the generosity of our brethren in France, instead of glorifying ourselves for a triumph which is not ours. There is not in the world an organisation which can show such results, in proportion to its expenditure, as the Society for the Propagation of the Faith;

there is none which has greater claims on our gratitude or Christian charity. Yet it is most inadequately supported by us. And there is no doubt that, with a little exertion, the subscriptions which it receives from England might be nearly doubled.

W.

EDMUND CAMPION.—No. VII.

AND now, before we follow the Jesuits on their mission, it would be well to describe the religious condition of the people to whom they were sent.

In August 1580, the twenty-second year of Elizabeth's reign was drawing to a close. A generation had been born and grown to manhood since she had altered the religion of the land. In 1558, when she succeeded to the throne, she found three parties in the country; the Catholics and two others, now known by names which they only acquired some years afterwards,—the Puritans and the Politicians.

The Catholics were not a united party; some had accepted the severities of Mary as a moral lesson, and had brought themselves to think that the "frying" of a "stinking heretic" at the stake was a comforting lesson; others had become disgusted at Mary's continual perquisition into secret opinions; and the majority, wearied out, had come to the conclusion, that it would be quite possible to live at peace with the heretic, instead of driving him forth from society to prison or to the stake.

The Puritans,—to call them by a name which, Sir Robert Cotton says, was first pinned to their skirts by Father Sanders about 1570,—led by the English refugees who had come back as fanatical adherents of the Continental Calvinists, with all the narrow sectarianism and bloodthirstiness of that sect, were far behind in numbers, but they brought two doctrines with them which gave them great influence: the first, that it is the duty and the right of the prince to choose the religion of his subjects; and next, that the duty of obedience in the subject cannot be divided between a temporal and spiritual superior. *Cujus regio, ejus religio*, was the formula of the first; *uni et univoce* of the second. Calvin, Knox, and Beza, with the fear of the two Marys, of England and Scotland, before their eyes, had thought it best to except females from this sovereign right. But "regiment of women" ceased to be "monstrous" on the accession of Elizabeth; though she never forgave the Calvinists for having once

played false with the fundamental principle of Protestant politics.

The Politicians,—to use a name given to the party by the Guises of France in 1568,* and applied by Davila† to those who acknowledged no fundamental difference between one religion and another, so far as the State is concerned,—were described by Stapleton as the children whom Rachel weeps for, because they are not; not her children at all, but “false and feigned Christians, neither Christians nor Catholics, but Politicians. Polite and civil, elegant and gentleman-like, prudent and wise, turning religion into policy, and making a mock at zeal; telling us that in these days we must wink at many things, do any thing for a quiet life, not stir up hornets’ nests; that the heresies of the day are too strong to be forcibly put down, too deep-seated to be plucked out of men’s minds; that the points are too unimportant for such a display of energy; at least not important enough to oblige politicians, who are not charged with the management of religion, to endanger the peace and prosperity of the country in the attempt to repress them. The prudent statesman’s first business is to provide for the welfare of his countrymen, to accommodate himself to the pleasure of his prince, to avoid all superfluous bickering about religion, and to leave its care to the clergy or to God, who is strong enough to avenge Himself, if He feels insulted by the new opinions.”‡

These Politicians, when Elizabeth came to the throne, had a double problem to solve: first, to secure the crown to the queen; and secondly, to give peace to the country, profoundly agitated by the Spanish policy of Queen Mary. The danger to the queen came from the Pope’s definition of her bastardy; to meet this, it was necessary to disable the Pope’s authority. The danger to the country was in the discord of the adherents of the various religions; the obvious remedy for this nowadays would be toleration for all; but in 1558 such a thought was almost impossible. The unity of religion in a country was reckoned to be a State necessity. Hence, where opinions were much divided, and the national character strong and obstinate, it was not deemed possible to favour any extreme and exclusive sect, but only to enforce moderation upon all; and this, not by allowing all to differ, but by obliging them all to meet on a common and, as it were, neutral ground. For the first of these State necessities the obvious measure was to confer once more on Elizabeth the ecclesiastical supremacy which Henry VIII. had arro-

* Thuanus, lib. xlix. c. 11.

† Lib. v. ad an. 1573.

‡ Stapleton, *Sermo contra Politicos*.

gated, and Mary had abjured. For the second, the Politicians took advantage of the profound weariness of the Catholics, and of the Protestant principle which gives a prince supreme power to choose the religion of his country, to devise a new formula which might satisfy both Catholics and Puritans, by suppressing all that either considered to be blasphemy, and by including only the "fundamentals" on which both were agreed.

After the queen's accession, the Politicians, who surrounded her, began by repressing the zeal of each side, forbidding all preaching, and all disputes, till they were delivered from the fear of foreign intervention by the treaty of Cateau Cambresis in April 1559.* Then the Parliament, in default of the Convocation, passed two measures; one for conferring on the queen the supremacy, and for imposing an oath on the subject in acknowledgment of it; and the other for abolishing the Mass, and substituting for it a form of prayer, which might be used in "common" by those who believed and those who disbelieved in Catholic doctrines. The first hope of the Politicians was that the existing Catholic hierarchy might be induced to connive at the new system, as they had done in Henry and Edward's time. With this view,—in spite of the frantic appeals which the Continental Reformers kept making to Elizabeth to play the part of Judith and Deborah, and destroy the Papists root and branch, seeing that Continental experience amply proved that the preservation of the externals of Popery always in the long-run led to its reëstablishment,—the old forms that met the eye were to be altered as little as possible; the vestments were to remain, and the hierarchical constitution, and, if possible, the same pastors. No doctrinal changes were to be made, only those portions of the old liturgy,—the adoration of the blessed Sacrament, and the worship of images and saints,—which were most offensive to the new opinions were to be dropped. The foreign Protestants were furious; they declared emphatically to their English followers, that they could not possibly take any ministerial part in a Church thus constituted. The question of vestments was declared a fundamental one.† But when it was seen that the queen and government were firm, the same counsellors advised their friends to dissimulate, and to "use the habits, provided they persisted in speaking and teaching against the use of them."‡ For the great

* Grindal to Hubert, May 23, 1559,—Zurich Letters, second series, p. 19.

† Peter Martyr to Thomas Sampson, July 15, 1559,—Zurich Letters, second series, p. 25.

‡ Peter Martyr to Sampson, Feb. 1, 1660, *ib.* p. 39.

fear of the Puritans was, lest they should be personally excluded from all share in the new establishment. Their first speculation was, whether the Bishops would conform; and, between hope and fear, they consoled themselves that they would rather resign, "as being ashamed, after so much tyranny and cruelty exercised under the banner of the Pope, and the obedience so lately sworn to him, to be again brought to a recantation, and convicted of manifest perjury."* When this external obstacle was once removed, the internal obstacle of their own consciences gave the Puritans little trouble, and they gladly accepted the commission to govern a Church, the constitution of which they thought wrong, in hopes of being able in time to conform it to their notions of right.

The Bishops all refused to take the oath, and were mostly deprived of their sees before the end of 1559. The Puritan leaders were substituted for them. On May 23, 1559, a royal commission was issued to visitors, partly lay, partly clerical, and all Puritan, to tender the oath to the rest of the clergy.† They were ordered to proceed with such moderation, as not to exasperate the Catholics, but to bring them gradually, by fair means, to a sense of their duty.‡ The first commission was too zealous; and in October the queen had to modify it, substituting laymen for several of the clergymen.§ But even their moderation had such serious effects that, in December, the queen had to write to the commissioners in both provinces to suspend their proceedings, and to determine such matters only as had been already begun.|| The effect of these arrangements was, that of the multitudes of clergymen who refused to subscribe, very few were immediately deprived; some had three years given them for consideration,¶ and others seem to have been connived at. In the visitation of the province of York in August and September 1559,** out of 89 clergymen summoned, 20 came and took the oath, 36 came and refused to swear, 17 were absent without proctors, 16 were absent with proctors. Yet of the 36 the lists of Bridgewater and Sanders only contain 5 names; of the 17, 4; of the 16, 7. If those lists are perfect, it proves that the rest were connived at, and perhaps retained their livings till their

* Grindal to Hubert, May 23, 1559, *ib.* p. 19.

† Rymer, xv. pp. 518, 519.

‡ Strype, *Life of Parker*, p. 125; and Heylin, *Hist. Ref.* vol. ii. p. 174.

§ Rymer, *ib.* pp. 546, 547.

|| State-Paper Office, *Dom. Eliz.* vol. vii. no. 79.

¶ *e.g.* Stapleton and Godsalue, prebendaries of Chichester, *Dom. Eliz.* xi. no. 25.

** *Dom. Eliz.* vii. no. 79.

death. In the province of Canterbury, we hear of the dean and canons of Winchester Cathedral, the warden and fellows of the College, and the master of St. Cross, all refusing the oath.* Yet only four of them are in Bridgewater's list. The visitation of the whole province gave the totals of 49 recusants, and 786 conformists,† significantly omitting the absentees. Thus, out of the 8911 parishes,‡ and 9400 beneficed clergymen,§ we find only 806 subscribers, while all the bishops and 85 others expressly refused to subscribe, and all the rest were absentees. The assertion, then, of Camden, that only 189 clergymen were deprived in this visitation proves nothing. Archbishop Parker had orders "not to push any one to extremities on account of his oath."|| But Sanders and Bridgewater give many more names; and even their lists, as Parsons owns, were imperfect. For, as Bramhall says, the writers at Rome, Rheims, and Douay were strangers to what was passing in England. It was the interest of the government to hide from the Catholics the real number of recusants, lest they should become over-bold. No wonder, then, that the priests were often tempted to complain with Elias, in Jezebel's persecution, "I only am left," when there were really seven thousand who had not bowed to Baal.

However, what with the expirations of the three years of grace, and fresh commissions sitting from time to time, the clergy, at first connived at, were gradually removed, and their places filled up with men who were required to acknowledge the queen to be supreme head of the Church of England upon earth; while no great difficulty was raised about other points of doctrine, provided they were willing to obey the laws of the realm.¶ Thus it came to pass that most of the clergy were "popish priests, consecrated to perform Mass; and the far greater part of the remainder most ignorant persons," appointed to spell through the prayers, but not allowed to preach.** I have said that the priests who refused the oath had far fewer scruples about the common prayer. When it was first introduced under Edward, some priests said the Latin Mass, some the English Communion; some both, some neither; some said half of the one, and half of the other. "And this mingle-mangle did every man make at his pleasure, as he thought it would be most grateful to

* Dom. Eliz. June 30, 1559, vol. iv. no. 72.

† British Museum, Lansdowne Ms. cix. p. 17.

‡ Dom. Eliz., vol. cvi. no. 7.

§ Camden, Eliz. i. 32.

|| Strype, Parker, p. 125.

¶ Percival Wibun, Report on the State of the Church of England,—Zurich Letters, second series, p. 358.

** George Withers, *ibid.* p. 163.

the people. But that which was of more importance and impiety, some did consecrate bread and wine, others did not, but would tell the people beforehand plainly that they would not consecrate, but restore them the bread and wine back again as they received it from them, only adding to it the Church-benediction. And after consecration, some did hold up the Host to be adored after the old fashion, and some did not. And of those that were present, some did kneel down and adore, others did shut their eyes, others turned their faces aside, others ran out of Church blaspheming, and crying 'Idolatry!'"* Under Elizabeth this state of things lasted with some modification. Before the service on Sunday, the priests would celebrate Mass in their own houses, and the Catholics would communicate there, while the Protestants communicated at church; or the priest would take to church the Hosts which he had consecrated at home, to give at the altar-rails to his Catholic parishioners, while he gave to the Protestants the wafers that had been used for the service in the Common Prayer-book. Thus the Sacrament of two hostile religious bodies was distributed by the same hands, at the same time, at the same altar-rails, to the discordant and divided flock.† During the Northern rebellion in 1569, the priests took occasion to restore the old service, and sang High Mass in Durham Cathedral. Among the State-Papers, there are instances of incumbents saying Mass in their houses much later; and even in 1592, we find several clergymen in one county giving large sums to a pretended pursuivant not to accuse them of Popery. It was only in 1579, in her twenty-first year, that Elizabeth felt strong enough to enforce a general obedience to the Act of Uniformity.‡

The oath of supremacy gave the queen permission to choose the religion of her subjects, and to enforce upon them the external observance of it. This, however objectionable in theory, did not seem likely to produce any immediate practical harm, as the queen was not supposed to be inclined towards the Puritans. Hence an opinion was circulated, that it gave power to the queen to minister at public worship, and to consecrate Bishops; this exaggeration was convenient, for it gave the Politicians an opportunity to publish injunctions, declaring that the supremacy meant nothing of the sort, but the same power which all the kings of England had claimed, "of sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born

* Parsons, *Three Conversions of England*, pt. ii. c. xii. p. 206, ed. London, 1688, fol.

† Sanders de Schismate, lib. iii. p. 342, ed. Col. 1610.

‡ See State-Papers of that year, *passim*.

within these her realms, of what estate, either ecclesiastical or temporal, soever they may be." "No power of ministry was challenged;" the queen was ready to accept as good subjects those who took the oath in its merely historical sense.* Still the royal supremacy was not merely the right of the executive magistrate to see that every corporation was what it professed to be, and administered its own laws justly, and that right was done by and to every corporation, religious or secular, within its territory. For there was no freedom for corporations in those days. The prince claimed the right of authorising one, and only one, corporation, and suppressing all others. If this right had been restricted to temporal corporations, and if freedom of choice had remained for spiritual corporations, the Catholics might have been inclined to have accepted it as a compromise,† however destructive of civil liberty the law might be. Similarly, their objection was not so much to any thing contained in the Common Prayer as to its omissions; the want of papal authority,‡ prayers to the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, prayers for the dead, the seven Sacraments, and external sacrifice; they even approved of prayers in the vulgar tongue. The one thing for which they rejected communion with the Establishment was its "lack of unity," its schism from the rest of Christendom, and its want of homogeneity in itself, "some being therein Protestants, some Puritans, and some of the Family of Love."§

Yet this lack of unity—of external unity with the rest of Christendom, and of internal unity with itself—was the one sacrifice which the Politicians were determined to make, in order to secure the political unity of the country, and the unity of the State with the Church. They were not going to commit the mistake of the Electors of the Palatinate, and force all Englishmen to believe alike, and to change their belief as often as the prince changed. But they insisted that no corporation apart from the State should have the power of branding Englishmen as heretics, and subjecting them to the social and political disabilities which that brand induced. Their theory was, to let every body believe as he liked, so as he came to church; to reckon all Englishmen as Churchmen, unless formally joined to some external body, and at the same time to proscribe all such external bodies, and to make adhesion to them treason.

And as the lack of religious unity was the point which the

* Apology for the oath, in Cecil's writing, Dom. Eliz. vol. xv. no. 27, 1560 (?).

† See Feckenham, Articles confessed by him at Wisbeach, 1580, Lansdowne Ms. no. 30, art. 77.

‡ Lansdowne Ms. xxvii. art. 20. § Lansdowne Ms. no. 30, ut sup.

Politicians were bent on enforcing, so it was that least offensive to the pious, and least observable by the unreflecting clergyman. It was only a suspension of discipline, an authoritative stoppage of the persecution which had disgusted the people by its cruelty. In country parishes where the people were all Catholic, and where the forced communion with heretics was therefore a dead letter, there was positively no change but the not unpopular substitution of the English for the Latin service. It appeared to be only a toleration that must at times be practised by all establishments, when their evil members are too numerous and powerful to be severely dealt with.* Its true character only came out step by step, year by year; and its full consequences were only revealed when custom and habit, enforced by policy, and irritated by many clumsy attempts to change them, had become too strong to be conquered.

As for the people, the two things that struck them were, the cessation of the unpopular persecution, and the change of service. The latter was no great novelty to them. For thirty years they had been used to variations, some of which had been made on illegitimate authority, some, as Mary's restoration, rightfully; but all had come proximately to the people on the authority of the State, whether it was the State acting schismatically or acting in obedience to Rome. So far as appeared externally, Elizabeth's change might be as authorised as Mary's; and there was little opportunity for becoming aware of its internal character. For the communication between Englishmen in those days was slow and difficult, and the Catholic portion of the people was divided geographically from the Protestant part, which was found chiefly about London and in the southern counties, especially in the sea-ports of the west. It was only among the Protestants that the full significance of the change could be at once understood. At first it appeared a boon to both parties,—the Catholics, who were tired of the Spanish persecution carried on in their name and for their behoof, and the Protestants, to whom it brought liberty, not without hopes of retaliation. This enabled Sir Robert Cotton to say, that "until the eleventh year of Elizabeth's reign (the end of 1569) a recusant's name was scarcely known." It was scarcely known, because it was the great object of the State not to know it, not to recognise that there were any dissidents, to dissimulate differences; not because the people were converted to Protestantism, nor altogether "because the zeal begotten in the time of the Marian persecution

* S. Augustin, c. ep. Parmeniani, lib. iii. c. 2; and Dec. Can., *non potest*, 23, q. 4.

was yet fresh in memory, and the late persecutors were so amazed with the sudden alteration of religion that they could not but say, *Digitus Dei est hic.*" Far less truth is there in the Utopian picture which Cotton proceeds to paint: "In those days there was emulation between clergy and laity, and a strife arose whether of them should show themselves most affectionate to the Gospel. Ministers haunted the houses of worthiest men, where now (1623) Jesuits build their tabernacles, and poor country churches were frequented with the best of the shire; the word of God was precious, prayer and preaching went hand in hand together, until Archbishop Grindal's disgrace" (1567): the very mention of which ought to have made Cotton ashamed of giving so false a representation of the matter.* Grindal's disgrace was in consequence of his patronage of the "liberty of prophesying," that is, of the preaching of Puritan ranters, which was every where driving the Catholics—who had hitherto acquiesced in the State Church—to open hostility. Fearing this result, Elizabeth ordered the exercise of prophesying to be suppressed, the preachers to be reduced to a smaller number, and homilies to be read instead of sermons. It was not Grindal's disgrace, but the impudence of the Puritans whom he patronised, that first made recusancy formidable.

For the people, partly for the reasons I have given above, partly because they hoped the changes were only temporary, like so many they had seen, and partly through fear,—“not knowing,” as Cotton says,† quite inconsistently with his account quoted above, “how far severity might extend,”—had, in the first years of Elizabeth, sunk their differences, and attended the church, where, for the most part, their old pastors yet ministered. But soon scandals arose; tinkers and cobblers succeeded to the pulpits of the grave theologians who were dispossessed. Some of the priests forgot their vows of celibacy; and as early as 1562, during a tour in Essex and Suffolk, Elizabeth was offended at the slovenly way of performing the service, and at the consequences of clerical marriage; and on her return issued an order against all resort of women to the lodgings of cathedrals and colleges;‡ while the Catholic gentlemen were so scandalised, that they sent to consult the Council of Trent whether their attendance at the churches could be permitted. The answer was a decided negative.§ I do not know whether any immediate measures were taken to publish this decision; but in 1567, St. Pius V.

* Cottoni Posthuma, p. 149.

† p. 133.

‡ Nares, Burghley, ii. 240, 241; Strype, Ann. i. 405; and Parker, i. 212.

§ See More, Hist. Prov. Aug. Soc. Jes. lib. iii. c. 6 sqq.

sent Dr. Sanders and Dr. Harding into England, with episcopal powers to grant faculties for the absolution of schismatics, but chiefly to declare that "there was no hope of exception or dispensation for any of the laity" to have their children baptised, or themselves to be "present at the communion of service now used in churches in England."* From this time large numbers of the Catholic laymen began to refuse to go to church; and the indirect measures taken against them by the government, together with the direct pressure of St. Pius V. through Dr. Morton, who was sent into England in 1568, provoked the unfortunate rebellion of the great northern earls in 1569, which rendered hopeless any peaceable restoration of Catholicism while Elizabeth lived.

The effect of these movements was gradually to divide the English Catholics into two bands,—the temporisers, or schismatics, who kept the faith, but frequented the churches, and the open Catholics, who braved fine and imprisonment, and refused to go to church. The rebellion of 1569 showed that, on the least provocation, the schismatics were ready to join the others, and to reëstablish the old religion by force. The Politicians, who had hitherto inclined rather to the Catholic side against the Puritans, were, even before that event, forced to remember that the Church which they had created hung on the single thread of the queen's life; that on her death Mary of Scotland would succeed, and would reverse all that had been accomplished in these eleven years. They therefore appealed to all the gentry, clergy, and tradesmen who wished to preserve the existing state of things, to join in a secret society for the protection of the queen, not unlike the associations of seven years later in France for the protection of the king and the French Catholics. By the very tenor of Burghley's proposition, it is clear that the appeal was made to the Puritans, and that the Puritan members of the Government no longer put forward the comprehensive character of the Church, but its exclusiveness, as its claim to their support. "No monarchy is so established by laws in good policy to remain in freedom from the tyranny of Rome, and in constancy and conformity of true doctrine, as England is. Wherein no person, of any state, is by law admitted to profess openly the contrary without punishment provided for the same by good

* Letter of Laurence Vaux, Dom. Eliz. vol. xli. art. 1. see Collier, vol. vi. p. 458, ed. 1840. He and Bishop Kennett (Lansdowne Ms. no. 951, p. 118) say that the faculties were granted Aug. 14. 1567. The latter refers to Sutcliffe's answer to Parsons. Sutcliffe, in his Challenge to Parsons, p. 181, talks of "faculties granted to Thomas Harding about the year 1567." These faculties were, however, given in 1566, for the letter of Vaux referring to them is dated Nov. 1st, in that year.

order of laws ; and such like, for the policy to all purposes, is not to be found in Christendom.”* Thus appealed to, the Puritans began a secret organisation, under the guidance of the Puritan members of the Privy Council, and were industrious in enrolling members. By 1578 the French ambassador had found it out, and wrote to his court that the Puritans were busy associating, and binding themselves by oath to extirpate the Catholic religion. This organisation ripened into the famous Society for the Preservation of the Queen, which makes a figure in the history of 1584. The religious questions at this date resolved themselves into a race for the favour of the queen.

The Catholics, apparently under the inspiration of the French ambassador, and after the example of the French societies of 1576, began in that very year to make a “combination,”† in which we find such names as the Earl of Northumberland, the Earl of Oxford, Lord Henry Howard, Charles Arundell, Giffard, and Jerningham. Their object apparently was to promote the queen’s marriage with the Duke of Anjou, which the Puritans as resolutely opposed. Except for the tragic end of the drama, the varieties of its progress are a complete comedy. There were the Puritans, furious against the match ; there was the Spanish ambassador, striving to persuade the Catholics to oppose it likewise ; there was the French ambassador, jaunty and gay, surrounded with his “combination,” or chorus of Catholic courtiers, whom he exhorted to be patient, for the end would crown the labour, and the queen’s new husband would secure their freedom of worship. There were the counsellors : the mysterious Burghley, in whom the world discovered a Solon, while Shakespeare more truly painted him as Polonius ; the profound and Mephistophelian Walsingham ; the versatile, handsome, and unprincipled Leicester ; and the rest,—whom the French ambassador persuaded himself that he was persuading to be sworn slaves of his master, in direct contradiction to their own interests. Lastly, there was the audacious queen, giving hopes to all, but satisfying none ; faithful to her policy of doing little, but letting events work themselves out, and making it her main business to preserve her personal popularity. The French ambassador was blinded with

* 7 June 1569, Dom. Eliz. vol. li. nos. 6 and 7. The exclusiveness and intolerance of the English State Church, when once transformed by the Puritans, became their great boast : “Nay, the Pope doth openly tolerate Jews and Mahometans, which blasphemeth the name of Christ ; which wickedness shall not be found in us.” Sutcliffe, *Answer to Owlyglasse’s Exceptions to his Challenge*, p. 202.

† Dom. Eliz. vol. cli. no. 39. The date of the paper is 1581, and it refers to five years before.

the good cheer of England, where there was talk of nothing but gallantry; and with the queen's progresses in the shires, where she gained all hearts, and where the wealthy gentry worshiped her on their knees. So far was she from preferring the Puritans, that many of her prime personal favourites were as near being Catholics as the irregularities of their lives would permit. Thus, Hatton, as Allen tells us, was one who had no doubt about the Catholic religion being true.* She made no objection to the religion of Anjou; indeed, she said that his fidelity to it was a claim on her respect; and in 1578 she agreed with the French ambassador that her husband was to be allowed to do as he liked in his own house, as she hoped to be allowed to do as she liked in hers;† and she told Leicester, a mortal enemy of the match, that "this was the year to marry off all the poor old maids in England; they should all be wedded with her." But nothing could make her act; she delayed, and the opponents of the match took the occasion to whisper that Anjou was dwarfish, bandy, pock-pitted, with bad breath, plenty of ambition, and more bigotry. He would be sure to establish the Catholic religion. Walsingham was sent over, confidentially, to look at the duke, and to report on these matters; he reassured the queen, who professed herself satisfied. Nevertheless the affair dragged on. In May 1579, the Earl of Huntingdon, a pretender to the crown, and the chief of the Puritan party, declared that the marriage would be the ruin of England and of the religion, and set on some ministers to preach in this sense. Elizabeth, with characteristic brevity, threatened to have them whipped. She took care to display an increasing coolness for the Common Prayer; and when she was conversing with Castelnau on her lover's charms, she could not tear herself away even when the chapel-bell rang. Burghley shook his head when he reflected how easy it would be to upset the established religion, considering the stake owned by Catholics in the land, the secret favour of the queen towards them, and her deafness to all whispers against them.‡ But nothing progressed, except the hopes of Castelnau. Many of the Catholic allies of the French ambassador were tired out; they were disgusted with Anjou's conduct, and ceased to trust in the queen's intentions to marry him, and so turned to the Spanish ambassador,§ who was glad of their assistance

* Responsio ad Edict. Reg. Ang. p. 21.

† Castelnau-Mauvissière, Despatch from London to Henry III. at Paris, Sept. 8, 1578, Ms. Imperial Library, Paris.

‡ Despatch of May 29, 1579.

§ The following speech is attributed by the Earl of Oxford to Charles Arundell, in the latter part of 1579 or 1580: "There was neither personage,

in discountenancing the match.* This laid the foundation of a split among the Catholics, and a counter-combination was set up, with the countenance of the Spanish ambassador. Those who remained faithful to the French were obliged to persuade themselves that the marriage would come off, and would at once heal all their afflictions. Therefore, every thing that helped on the match, however calamitous for the moment to the Catholic religion, was ultimately for its benefit. They must not let it be thought that Anjou was a bigoted Papist, or the Puritans would never acquiesce in the match; his agents must therefore, for the present, abstain from using their influence in favour of the oppressed Catholics; only a little patience, a little more suffering under the atrocious penal laws, and all would be over; Anjou would be king, and would soon lay the axe to the root of the tree. Only let the Catholics dissimulate a little longer, and shut their eyes to the daily tragedies of their brethren, and the new state of things for which these tragedies would smooth the way would be the remedy for them all. The Spanish ambassador had no such political reasons for dissimulation, and could afford to call a spade a spade. Round him, then, gathered the generous Catholic youth, who were prepared for any sacrifice, who were tired of waiting on the caprices of a woman, and who were resolved henceforth to dissimulate nothing. Yet the necessities of the times compelled them to adopt a secret organisation, and they thus gave birth to a curious monster, —a secret society which could not remain secret, the first duty of its members being to absent themselves from services which the law bade them attend. To them it would have been useless to have “the receipt of fern-seed,—to walk invisible,” for their invisibility at church was the first overt act of their “sedition.” Theirs was a secret society whose object was to make secret believers into open professors; a secret society to destroy secrecy. They had given up the race to get the start in the favour of the prince; the Puritans had won, and now, *we victis*. No “courtesy, humanity, or reasonable indifference,” could be had from such ignoble conquerors. Catholics were shut out from “speech, conference,

religion, wit, or constancy” in Anjou; Arundell “had long given up that course, and taken another way,—which was to Spain,”—ever since the Lord Chamberlain had by his own obstinacy missed the opportunity of disgracing for ever the enemies of the match, whereby the French agent Semier was “so discouraged as never after he had mind to strain any longer, reputing the whole cause then to be overthrown.” Arundell had “made an end of Anjou’s cause, and liked it no more; but spoke of the Spanish king’s piety, greatness, and wealth,” and prophesied that he would be monarch of the world. Dom. Eliz. vol. cli. no. 39.

* Despatch of July 26, 1579.

writing, disputing, or any other fair trial of their cause ;” they were watched, spied, examined every where ; attached, transported, imprisoned, racked, or hanged, if they spoke or argued.

Still a section, hoping against hope, adhered to the French ambassador. In July 1579, Elizabeth imprisoned a preacher for talking against foreign alliances and mixed marriages. This raised their hopes, only to be immediately dashed by one of those occurrences which were always a pretext for fresh delays. Fitzmorris, with a company of Bretons, made a descent on Ireland, and occupied Limerick. The Spanish ambassador loudly accused Henry III. of France as an accomplice of the wild Irishman ; while Castelnau declared it was a plot of Philip II. to stop the match, and that he had condescended even to conspire with the Calvinists against it. At the same time (Oct. 1579), he declared that the queen’s better treatment of the Catholics had won back many of them from the Spanish interests. He noted the ever-increasing fury of the Puritans, their petitions to parliament, the way they worked on the fears of the “timid” queen, and their declaration that Anjou would soon have a St. Bartholomew’s Day in England. He enlarged on Stubbs’s pamphlet, “The Gulph wherein England will be swallowed by the Marriage ;” the fury of the queen, who wanted him hanged, her disappointment when the jury would not find him guilty of felony, the disgrace of the judge, the interest that was made to have Stubbs pardoned, and Elizabeth’s final command to have the sentence (loss of his right hand) executed upon him before her window at eight o’clock one morning. Leicester and Walsingham, with the rest of the Puritans, were in disgrace ; Elizabeth was furious ; and Anjou was foolish enough to direct Castelnau to intercede for them. They swore fidelity to the French interests ; and he accordingly reconciled them to the queen. This was in obedience to the duke’s instructions, “to accept every one’s service, and not to keep any one in disgrace on his account.” “I think,” says Castelnau, with a simplicity wonderful in so old a courtier, “that from this time Leicester will seek to maintain himself by the aid of France.” However, Leicester, Walsingham, Huntingdon, and Pembroke, soon used their restored power in exactly the opposite direction ; and, February 8, 1580, Castelnau was obliged to confess that the queen’s ill-humour and cruelty to the mislikers of the match had alienated from her (or it) a great part of her nobles and people, and obliged her to ask a further delay, and that she had given too much credit to those whom she had just restored to power.

Thus did these negotiations drag on ; Castelnau's cleverness ever overreached by his vanity, which made him believe in victory when he had only fallen into a trap. But Solomon himself could not have succeeded. Elizabeth had once possessed power to change the religion of England ; but to this end she had been obliged to arm the Puritans and disarm the Catholics, and now the Puritans were too powerful to be overcome. Even if the Catholics had succeeded in making Elizabeth marry Anjou, I doubt whether it would have done much more for the Catholics than the marriage of Charles with Henrietta forty years later. But the Puritans were determined not to risk the change if they could help it, and so much the more as they saw the Catholics desirous of it. On July 5, 1580, Castelnau writes, "The Puritans fear that if the queen is married, the Catholics will soon get the upper hand ; and suppose that she has a great fancy for them, because she treats them more mildly than she has done for twenty years. And, indeed, the number of Catholics has much increased, and they have raised their heads a little too soon, and built too much on the hopes of the marriage."

It was just at this time that Campion and Parsons were coming into England. Their arrival was another of those events to which Castelnau attributed his want of success. About the same time also Condé came over to complain to Elizabeth of the treatment of the French Protestants by Henry III. Elizabeth refused to continue the negotiations for the marriage till Henry had made peace with them. Henry of course refused to forego the advantages he had gained.* Elizabeth replied by complaining of a visit of the Earl of Westmoreland to Paris, of Dr. Allen's seminary at Rheims, and of the fifty priests just sent over to preach sedition. This, said she, was the reason of her temporising. Henry retorted, that Elizabeth had received Condé, whom he asked her to send away ; and there seemed every element of a diplomatic quarrel, when suddenly there came news to London of the defection of some of the queen's most powerful Irish friends. Castelnau considered the government in great danger. "I believe," he wrote, "that if monarchs will be obstinate in their civil wars, subjects will not be without pretexts for casting off their allegiance."† In the following despatches, August 13 and 30, he describes the severe measures that the council thought of taking against the Catholics. In September, the queen heard of the landing of the joint Span-

* Pinard, *Dépêche à Mauvissière*, Paris, Bib. Imp. Ancien Fonds, no. 8810. Despatch of July 10, 1580.

† August 8, 1580.

ish and Papal expedition in Ireland. The danger was great, and so was the terror. She implored Henry to send at once an army into the Low Countries, otherwise this would only be the forerunner of many expeditions. In November the Irish bubble burst; and Castelnau told his master that "the Spaniards and Italians behaved like great poltroons, and had their throats cut. Lord Grey, the viceroy, had all the Irish hanged, except a priest, who was to be sent into England, and Dr. Sanders, a great preacher, and too good a theologian to fight. The expedition was magnificently provided, but it would have been better if they had been furnished with less money and more manfulness."

I quote these passages to show what were the peculiar complications of the time when the mission of the Jesuits began in England. But I will not proceed with Campion's history till I have briefly reviewed the position of the Anglican clergy, and of the common people.

The members of the Puritan hierarchy intruded into the English sees in 1569 and 1560 had accepted a position which they did not approve. They were all Calvinists, except Cheney of Gloucester, who was a Lutheran; the vast majority of the clergy was Catholic, and hardly yet recognised its schismatical position. The queen would allow no further innovations in the externals of religion, but was incurious about doctrine; hence the new Bishops were able to get in their wedge of Calvinistic intolerance in the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, the bulwark against retrogression towards Rome, and against such a development of the truths still left in the Prayer-Book as should necessitate the restoration of those which had been dropped. These articles were intended to narrow the comprehensive character of the Church by providing that all the new clergy should be Calvinist. Next, the Bishops gave an extraordinary latitude to the "liberty of prophesying," which might have developed the establishment into a Genevan conventicle, had not Elizabeth interposed with her veto. Many of the Politicians, convinced that the Catholic party would restore the Papal supremacy and the exclusiveness of the Church the first day they had the power, had now turned to the Puritans. Not that they had any intention of submitting to the Genevan discipline; but they were willing to allow it so far as the suppression of the bishoprics and cathedrals, and the confiscation of their goods. Again, the ignorant low-bred Calvinists were easier to exclude from all share in government than the highly-educated Roman ecclesiastic, or the Anglican who had succeeded to the inheritance of the English universities.

Hence "they sought to disgrace the clergy," scarcely admitting them to matters of state at all, "contrary to the practice of all well-governed commonwealths, and of our own till these late years."*

But Elizabeth disgraced Archbishop Grindal, the leader of the Puritan party, and began to advance the men to whom the gradual development of Anglicanism is due. They had to conciliate the forms of a Catholic hierarchy, and of a Catholic but mutilated prayer-book, with Puritan articles of faith. They had at once to defend conservatism and revolution, to derive their authority from the old Church, and to claim a right for the State to modify the doctrines of that Church without thereby destroying its essence. They had to make the comprehensive political *via media* of 1559 into an eternal and exclusive principle of truth; as if the truth, which may perhaps be the middle point between all possible errors, can be determined by taking two presumed errors which happened to coexist in 1559, and by assuming for all time that the middle point between them is the truth. This *via media* was at first a sort of indefinite precinct, shutting off two extreme opinions, but enclosing all between them; it was afterwards turned into a religious theory, and petrified into a sham principle. It was originally an abasement of the Church before a supposititious public opinion, for the convenience of statesmen. It would have been a recognition of the supremacy of the mob if the real opinions of the people had been such as they were said to be. But the State made the Church Anglican in pretended deference to the feelings of a people who were chiefly Catholic, and partly Puritan. These sections refused to be amalgamated. The Puritans would not receive the teaching of Bishops who wore surplices. The Catholics, whose priests and schoolmasters were driven away or hanged, stood aloof, and would listen to no one else. For three or four generations their descendants preserved "the perfume of Rome," as Cotton says, and afterwards were gradually assimilated to the surrounding population, still, however, retaining a traditional hostility to the State Church.

The English hierarchy, thus cut off from both the Catholic and Puritan sections of the people, but retaining all the aristocratic influence that their feudal possessions gave them, were from the first the clergy of the rich, not the clergy of the poor. They were gentlemen, learned men, lords; but not apostles or saints. Their wealthy leisure, combined with

* Geo. Cranmer, letter to Hooker, Feb. 1598,—Keble's Hooker, vol. ii. p. 606.

their professional tastes, enabled them to preserve, what circumstances have led both Catholics and Puritans to neglect, the artistic and literary beauty of the liturgical language. When Christianity was the business of life, and time was no consideration, prayers might be as difficult as a chorus of *Æschylus*, or a sonnet of *Dante*. But when religion became not so much the occupation as the qualification of life, when less time was given to the direct exercises of devotion, the old enigmas were felt to be too hard. The breviary services were too long, the psalms too difficult. A new style of prayer was wanted, arranged in the most logical order, interrupted by rubrics, to tell us where to elicit one kind of act, and where another, and with language most simple and plain-spoken. The Jesuits saw what was wanted, and provided it; the Puritans felt that some change was wanted, and offered their ranting preaching and their *extempore* prayers as the solution of the difficulty. The Anglican hierarchy alone,—not pressed for time, not overburdened with “acts” and “aspirations”—kept up the old intellectual interest in the services, and popularised the psalms and the devotional use of the Old and New Testaments, not perhaps to any great extent, but more widely than has been done by other hierarchies or sects. And it was this literary exclusiveness that made them call those popularisers of devotion, the Jesuits, “the Puritans of Popery.”

To turn now from the Anglican clergy to the English people, who were so profoundly alienated from them, whose state I shall only touch upon so far as it affected the mission of Campion. All the Catholic part of the population had been surprised into the change of religion. No choice was given to them: they saw the service changed; but they saw also that no measures were taken to make them change their faith. They saw, for the most part, their pastors retaining their benefices, sometimes indeed displaced to make room for an ignorant ranter; but then, in turn, they saw this ranter’s mouth stopped, and himself reduced to a mere reader of prayers and homilies. The people bore this patiently, because it brought calm after the troubles and persecutions of Mary’s time, and because they hoped it would in its turn soon come to an end. In the mean time they might enjoy the holiday which the collapse of discipline had sent them, ready to reënter the vineyard, and work, as soon as they were called. Throughout the country and small towns, where the strength of the Catholic party was to be found, the people formed two political classes—the gentry or nobility, and the commonalty. Both classes still maintained the feudal feel-

ings; still the chief nobleman in every shire desired to see all the gentry of his county wear his livery, and acknowledge themselves his servants; while the gentry maintained the same feudal relations with the husbandmen and cottagers who lived on the family estate. The power of England had, up to the time of Henry VII., been in the hands of these nobles and gentry, who were not yet conscious that they had lost it. The overwhelming strength of the earl in his own county looked like universal power, till the fate of the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, and of the Duke of Norfolk, showed how weak the local centres had become in comparison to the combining force of the royal centralisation in London. But this lesson was not enough. It was still every where believed that rank was power; that the queen was able by a word to restore every thing as it had been; and that if she would not speak this word, the nobles and gentry might unite and dethrone her. Failing this, at least so many of the gentry might declare their adherence to the old religion as to extort a toleration, if not from her compassion, at least from her fears, as not knowing what this persecuted class might do in case of foreign invasion. In this argument the populace counted for nothing. It was taken for granted that they would follow wherever they were led, and they were treated almost as if they were incapable of intelligent conviction in matters of faith.

The great fact of the day was the power of the governor to change the belief of his subjects. By means of this fact Luther had succeeded in Germany, and Henry VIII. in England. The Jesuits quickly comprehended the state of affairs, and by similar means wrought a vast restoration of religion in Germany and in France. The same system was to be applied to England; and if Elizabeth could not be made its instrument, her bastardy gave a famous opportunity to the Pope to exert the deposing power, and to give her crown to a more faithful child of the Church. Such was the policy of Pius V. and of Gregory XIII., who sent Campion and Parsons into England. Such also was Parsons' private opinion, as may be seen from Campion's reply to one of his letters in a former chapter. But they were not sent to England to carry out this policy; they were not supposed to know any thing about it; they were only to convert the nobility and gentry to the Church, and await the consequences.

The people to whom they were sent had no settled conviction against the truth of Catholicism; their inclinations led them towards it, only their fear or their indolence prevented their profession of it. Their external show of Protestantism

was rather cowardice and sloth than heresy, rather a helplessness than a strong passion. It was their will that had to be strengthened, rather than their mind to be enlightened. Hence the absence in those days of any depth of intellectual discussion. The arguments were addressed to the heart of the people, or to their terror. *Fugienda imprimis controversia*, said Father le Fèvre to Father Laynez about the reduction of the first Lutherans. First their affections must be cured, then their faith; the way to their head is through their heart. Persuade them to be moral, and they will soon be Catholics. They are heretics because they despair of being able to live as Catholics; strengthen them to do their duty, and they will naturally come back to the faith they learnt at their mothers' knees. The English might be warned that acquiescence in the State religion was no such security as they fancied. The queen would die some day, and her successor would restore all; perhaps the Pope and the French and Spanish kings would come and dethrone her, and extirpate the heretics. Even in 1623, the people were still "timorous through forecasting the restoration of Popery;" and to this day the saying survives among them,—“the Catholic religion was the first, and shall be the last.” Thus they were always looking out for a sign of its return. A flood, or a comet, or a monstrous birth, sent a thrill through England, and awakened the expectation of the “golden day” that was to restore the old religion. No picture of those times is complete that does not catalogue these prodigies, which had so extraordinary an effect on the belief of the people. On the day of the election of St. Pius V., Maffei tells us,* a comet, like blood, stood over London, and near its tail a hand issued from a cloud, and brandished a sword. 1580 (the year the Jesuits entered the country) was distinguished by a profusion of such portents. Father Parsons, in his life of Campion, recites from Stowe,† April 2d, an earthquake in London, which made the great bell of Westminster toll of itself, and threw down portions of the Temple Church, and of Christ Church, Newgate Street, at sermon-time, and slew two persons. In June great storms of thunder and hail. One Alice Perin, eighty years of age, brought forth a monster with a head like a helmet, a face like a man, a mouth like a mouse, a human body, eight legs, all different, and a tail half a yard long. Agnes, the wife of Mr. — (Father Parsons leaves the name blank; it is scarcely worth while to refer to Stowe to restore it), gave birth to a monster that was male and

* p. 47.

† Chron., ed. 1580. The passages are suppressed in the ed. of 1592.

female, with mouth and eyes like a lion. On May 18th, a vision of a hostile fleet was seen at sea off Bodmin; a pack of hounds was heard and seen in the air in Wiltshire; and in Somersetshire three several companies of sixty men in black appeared in the air, one after another. At a time when a student of magic occupied the imperial throne, and when Lord Burghley was entreating Kelly, the quack conjurer, not to deprive his native country of the good gifts God had given him, it is not to be wondered at if such predictions as may now be seen in Moore's Almanack had a vast effect on men's minds. The old priests still occasionally warned their flocks of their evil state. A Lincolnshire boor informed the council how Parson Britton, minister of Bonnington, preached that there was no salvation for those who went without confession and penance. "You must confess," he said, "not to bad fellows like me; but if you seek for them, there be honest men in the country." The boor accordingly sought, and found an honest man, who persuaded him that "there would be amendment this year (1580) of religion," and showed him in a book the cabalistic words, "E shall fall, and I shall stand instead; and I is not J, and shall not continue; and there shall be a musing Midsummer, a murdering Michaelmas, a bloody March. All after merry shall be."* One instance is as good as twenty of the sort of sayings that were current among the people in reference to the immediate restoration of the old faith. It was needful to persuade them that it would be so; they were quite willing that it should be.

Such were the people to whom the Jesuits were sent, to bid them separate themselves from the communion of the heretics, and to forbear going to their churches, whatever the penal consequences might be. They came to separate what the queen wanted to unite, and accordingly she issued her proclamations, warning the people against them as enemies of herself, and of Church and State, who were to be diligently sought for as persons perilous to the public weal. Yet when they came, they were found to be men of peace, churchmen without weapons, teaching the old doctrine, fasting and praying, preaching confession and restitution, and offering to dispute about these points with the new ministers, whose lives were known to be far distant from any of these things. How they prospered with this people, I shall have to tell in the future chapters of this life.

* Dom. Eliz. vol. cxliv. art. 48, Dec. 12, 1580.

Correspondence.

PHYSICAL AND MORAL SCIENCES IN RELATION TO RELIGION.

SIR,—An opinion is expressed in an article in the *Rambler* for September, p. 300, which may be accurate enough, though it sounds strange to persons who watch the progress of controversy mainly or exclusively in England. You say that the physical sciences, “when directed against religion, have not the same force as the sciences which are connected with her origin, her history, and her doctrine,”—that is, as the moral sciences.

I suppose that by “religion” you mean the Catholic faith and discipline, otherwise your assertion approaches a mere truism. For the moral sciences can scarcely be directed against religion itself, only against some particular forms of it. Atheism in history, politics, or morals is impossible when those sciences are studied in their proper method; but the physical sciences are in themselves atheistic, for they cease to be physical, and become moral, when they are directed to the proof of a God, or derived from His supernatural acts. Physical sciences in themselves are of no religion at all; moral sciences, even when atheistically pursued, become religious in their way; for even atheism may be made into a dogma, and may become the parent of a whole scheme of morals. Moral sciences, then, are never directed to the annihilation of religion, but only to its perversion or change. Physical sciences, when directed against religion, only attack it accidentally,—in its points of asserted contact with the world of phenomena. But here they wage a war of extermination; they deny the reality of the contact; they account for the phenomena which religion claims as her own upon merely physical laws, and they thus introduce and encourage the suspicion that the claims of religion are due only to the imagination of the pious, or to the imposture of the cheat.

Now this seems to me to be the special form of anti-religious controversy at the present day: it is not in favour of any religion, but against all forms of faith. It strives to make faith forgotten, and to supplant the supernatural by the natural world.* And where these tactics have not succeeded, still, as you own, moral science has assumed something of the indifference of natural philosophy. It strives to have no abstract preference for one rather than another conclusion; it has no final cause out of itself; it strives for truth in its own order, and for that alone. By these means even moral sciences may be bleached from all religious hues almost as perfectly as the physical sciences; and the historical inquiry into the development of law, or of society, or of the moral code, or of politics, need

* Dr. Newman has drawn an admirable picture of this “form of infidelity of the day” in the eighth of his *Lectures on University Subjects*, 1859.

no more refer to the existence of a God than the history of physiological or physical developments in the progressive changes of the earth's crust, or the successive appearances of new species in its *fauna*. In fact, many of those sciences hitherto called moral, such as philology, have in the hands of the followers of the new method assumed the aspect of physical sciences. Philologists have shown that the question of the origin of languages may be studied in the development of grammar and vocabularies with as great freedom from all religious or moral interferences as physiologists exhibit when they trace the origin of life through the development of the ovum, or naturalists when they attempt to reach the one great central force of the universe through the correlation of physical forces.

But when physical science, or the moral sciences in their physical method of treatment, do impinge upon religion, the result is much more decisive than when moral science, in its old form, contradicts religion. In the latter case the opposition was always rather rhetorical than logical, and, like all rhetorical commonplaces, might be turned to prove either the affirmative or negative by an adroit reasoner. Physical science, on the contrary, when it does smash any religious opinion, smashes it hopelessly and entirely; and the only resource of religion is to deny its former self, and to retire to another position. It is true that physical science can only attack religion in those points where religion has mixed herself up with natural phenomena; but the number of such points is very considerable. In our own day how many such have been invaded by physical science? I was taught, as part of the doctrine of creation, that God made the world about 6000 years ago; that He made it in six days; that at first there was no death upon the earth; that lions ate straw like oxen, till Adam fell, when beast began to prey upon beast, bloodshed began, and has followed to this time. That after some centuries God drowned the whole earth with a deluge, and only saved alive the family of Noah, so that all history of the present human race begins from that patriarch. Moreover, I was taught that the Deluge was the effect of the first rain, that previously there had been only mists, and that Noah saw the first rainbow when he emerged from the ark. Though religion has survived the rude shocks she received in the destruction or weakening of all these opinions, it would be nonsense to say that she has suffered no losses in the conflict.

But perhaps you will deny that religion has the right to be mixed up with any questions which are within the province of the physical philosopher. I am not disposed to quarrel with this position. I only assert that religion as it exists in the world has not yet come to this state of freedom. The inveterate practice of eighteen centuries at least has bound it up with certain views of Scripture, with certain interpretations of Moses and Josue and David, common to the Christians of Rome, Moscow, and London. If religion was purged of all these points of contact with physical science, the natural sciences would scarcely ever be able to reach religion, except when

they were in combination with the moral and metaphysical sciences. The real questions then would not be about Moses or Josue, but about creation, about the existence of a spiritual world, about the unity of mankind. Still, though the substance of religion should be defecated from all points of contact with matter and physics, yet its evidences must still remain in the sphere of phenomena, which is also the sphere of natural science. Natural science will always claim the right of discussing how far the miracles of Christianity were really miracles, or how far the physical anticipations or scientific prophecies of Moses are confirmed*by the physical sciences. Physical science will always have something to say about the *fact* of a revelation so far as it depends on physical evidences. Historical science discusses the same *fact* so far as it depends on historical evidences. Metaphysics and morals go a step farther, and inquire whether the asserted revelations are or are not possible; whether they are in conformity with themselves, and with the fundamental principles of conscience and intelligence.

I have said that physical science makes no account of God, and is therefore atheistic, not by denying Him, but by ignoring Him. In the same way it puts aside the human soul. Physical science is materialistic, not necessarily by denying, but by being obliged to forget the human soul. The soul is a free cause. The contrary object of physical science is to do away with all free causes, especially intermediate ones; she may put up with a free Creator at the end of the infinite chain of natural causation, because she knows well that she will never get to that end, or be brought face to face with a power which can be bound by no necessary law emanating from a higher cause; but the soul of man may intervene in every link of the chain; and therefore physical science has a greater grudge against man's spiritual liberty than against the freedom of the Creator. Hence physiology has undertaken the task of proving that man's intelligence is only a development of the intelligence of brutes, and that the boundaries between the lowest specimens of human intelligence and the highest examples of brutal instinct are evanescent, and, indeed, that man's brain naturally descends from that of apes by an evolution which is universal in the animal world, and which gradually produces new species of living creatures out of older ones. The Cardinal, in the discourse which you review, makes very great concessions to this principle. He says: "Let any number of new hideous apes be found in Africa, and hailed as a more remote progenitor by enlightened naturalists, I will be satisfied to end my genealogy at *the first of the line* endowed with reason, instead of pursuing it into the primevalness of ferocity." As much as to say, Let us grant that man physically descends from apes; yet the first in the series that received the new gift of reason is our Adam, our first man, our real first father: the apes from which he was descended are no more our ancestors than the atoms of dust out of which, on the supposition hitherto current among Christians, Adam's body was formed by God, have a title to a place

in our genealogy. This admission seems to me like breaking a hole in a dike. It will be difficult to stop the flood of consequences.

And not only does physical science in its essence refuse all place to God and soul, but it also adopts methods which are totally inapplicable to any theological or moral science. And yet one great characteristic of the present day is the attempt to make this application. Look at the statistical history of Mr. Buckle: who does not feel that if his method is once admitted, his conclusion follows as a matter of course? I remember that you proved, to my mind conclusively, when you reviewed his first volume, that it was impossible to consider free acts statistically; that the abstraction of their freedom was the first step in dressing them up and preparing them for a statistical induction. I should like to know whether, in your opinion, this statistical mode of treating history as a necessary series of psychological effects of material and psychological causes is or is not growing. Among the reviews of Mr. Buckle I have seen scarcely any intelligent protests against his method, but only against his individual conclusions. Whereas, if his method is right, his conclusions are indisputable.

My reasons, then, for considering physical science as the present great enemy of religion are,—First, that it directly contradicts many opinions concerning the nature and history of the world, which have been hitherto intimately bound up with religion.

Secondly, that it necessarily ignores God and the soul; it has nothing to do with them directly; all considerations of them must be abstracted from the propositions which are submitted to its methods.

Thirdly, that a very strong tendency to introduce these physical, materialist, Baconian methods into moral science exists among historians and moral philosophers, and that the result of this introduction must be to banish God and the soul from moral science, which is their proper sphere, as well as from physical science, where, except indirectly, they have no special place.

On the other hand it is quite clear that where the controversy is not between religion and atheism, but between one form of religion and another, the arguments must all be drawn from the moral sciences. The contempt of physical science for all forms of religion is quite impartial; it has no favourites; it knows no more of Mormonism than of Catholicism. Hence objections to the Church from natural science are made only in the name of unbelief; objections gathered from historical and moral sciences are the basis of Protestantism and of every heresy and false religion. Hence, too, the Church has allies while fighting against the natural philosopher; for all religions are equally interested in her victory. But when fighting against another religion, she has no allies; all sects are naturally glad to see their great rival humiliated; and if it is done only with moral weapons, it does not seem to them that religion and morality really suffer by the conflict. Neither must it be supposed that the progress of the age has been confined to physical science, or that

the only tendency in existence is that of assimilating the method of moral sciences to that of physical ones. Apart from, and in contradiction to, this tendency, the sciences of history, of language, and of jurisprudence have received quite a new form in our age. In the accumulation, criticism, and arrangement of materials, and in the method of conducting the argument, these sciences are positively new. There is as great a difference between history now and history in Gibbon's time, as between the astronomies of professors before and after the time of Copernicus.

Hence it seems to me that persons will estimate the force of objections against Catholicity and Christianity derived from physical sciences, as compared with those derived from moral sciences, by the scale of their previous opinion as to the kind of danger which now chiefly besets the Catholic Christian. Is his temptation more towards an aberration in the direction of some degrading superstition, like Mormonism, or some fanaticism, like Methodism or Puritanism, or towards scepticism, materialism, and infidelity? If the latter, his difficulties probably come from the side of physical science; if the former, from that of the moral sciences. It seems to me, however, that a person or an academy that wishes either to understand, or, in a measure, to control, the current of religious thought must determine to study with some impartiality both branches of modern science in their relation with religion.

D. N.

COLONIES.

SIR,—The recent publication of Mr. Marshall and Mr. Goldwin Smith's letter suggest many considerations on our Colonial Empire, and lead us to inquire into the religious character of our colonial system.

First, we may assume (as part of the divine economy which appears in the whole history of religion) that the conquest of the world by the Christian powers is the preliminary step to its conversion. In paganism and in heresy there is a national and political character which identifies the religion with the nation, and requires for it the support of the State. The religion is the life of the State, and the pride of the people. The whole system of government, the whole condition of society, the literature, the cultivation, and the language are penetrated by it.

Here the Church cannot at once find entrance. If the nation is civilised, the national religion must first have lost its strength, the national faith must first be weakened, and a longing for something new must first be awakened. But if the race is degenerate, something must be done to elevate and to prepare it for the Church. For the Church cannot triumph either over a finished civilisation or over an extreme barbarism.

In the Roman world the nationality of religion had been de-

stroyed, and paganism had been exhausted in order to make way for Christ. Where this change had not been wrought, and where the national heathen system still remained undecayed, Christianity was quickly extirpated. The conversion of the Germans resembled that of the Romans: their states were broken up, and their local traditions destroyed, and they were converted in the very moment of migration and settlement.*

It is hard to conceive how the rest of the Pagan world is to be converted otherwise. The same means is still requisite to prepare the two extremes of barbarism and cultivation for the reception of Christianity—conquest by European powers. This alone can destroy the tenacity of old institutions, of social divisions, of moral customs, of political habits. By this alone can the benefit of a higher civilisation be conferred on the savage races.

The Church, whose cradle was a universal empire, has ever retained and cherished the idea of the political union of mankind. This idea was revived after the fall of the Western and the decline of the Eastern empire, in the creation of Charlemagne, and again in the Crusades, as they were planned by Hildebrand, and in the division of the world by a meridian at the commencement of the Asiatic and American empires of Portugal and Spain. But the idea has been brought nearer to fulfilment by colonisation than it could ever be by conquest.

The colonies of Spain and of England are the two great instruments by which the idea has been partially realised; between these two sets of colonies there is this great providential contrast, that one deals more with the lower, the other with the higher races. The Spaniards have been brought into contact chiefly with barbarous races that required to receive Christianity in the shape of civilisation; the English with races in which conversion had to be preceded by partial destruction, in which insurmountable obstacles to conversion subsisted in the forms of social life, and in which the pioneer of the Church was the soldier, and not the missionary.

In the former case Catholicism alone can avail. In the latter it is not requisite at first. It is indifferent what the religion of the destroyer be, provided he is animated with the common ideas of Christian civilisation. But the Church alone can undertake the spiritual care of the savage, and protect him against the rapacity of the invader. For she is not the Church of the invader alone, she belongs to both, and has duties toward both; the conversion of the heathen is as much her business as the preservation of the faithful. She does not allow the natives to be oppressed; she does not even allow them to be neglected or ignored. She also differs from Protestantism in her influence on the State, on its laws, and on the clergy; and she has in her provincial councils the means of legislating for the good of the savage natives.

All these are peculiar advantages when the civilised European

* In Saxony the absence of migration was made up for by wars of extermination and proselytism.

is brought into contact with the untutored savage, who has to learn the rudiments of morality with those of the Christian religion. But they are of no use in dealing with Hindoo or Japanese civilisation.

These characteristics of the Church were moreover peculiarly useful in the Spanish colonies, which were founded in countries where Europeans could not work, where the natives were not industrious, and where the absence of flocks and herds made life dependent on the tillage of the soil, and therefore on the abundant supply of human labour. Here, consequently, the natives became instantly subject to the invader, and were compelled to work on his account. Though they obtained some relief through the importation of Africans, which was due to the humanity of Las Casas, they were generally reduced to the condition of labourers for the profit of the Spaniards. Fixed relations grew up between the races, which required to be regulated by the Church, in harmony with the interests of the weak. The Spaniards were cruel and ruthless task-masters; their pride of race, and their contempt for the foreigner and the heathen, as fierce as that of Jew for Gentile, and as complacent as that of Greek for barbarian, and their natural indolence,—all contributed to make them far more intolerable and more exacting than any other European colonists. The horrors perpetrated by the conquistadores are only equalled by the marvels which were achieved by the Church and the Spanish crown in introducing order and happiness among the settlers and the natives.

The history of the English on the American continent was different. The natives whom they encountered lived mostly by the chase (for North as well as South America were totally destitute of pastoral life). Hence they could not be made to work mines, or to till the soil. The object of the English, therefore, was to get rid of them; and though this was accomplished in general without cruelty or injustice, yet the claim of the Red-skins to the higher civilisation of Christianity was overlooked. In the colonies they could not be turned to account even as Christians; outside the colonies they could not be Christians without discontinuing their wandering life, and even so there would have been no place for them in the English settlements. The colonists were free; at least they enjoyed more liberty than the people at home. They governed themselves. An inferior race could not have existed among them on terms of equality. Such a race would have been quickly reduced to pauperism, and would have fallen into bondage, and have been exposed to unmitigated cruelty. For the English colonies had not, like those of Spain, the protection of a supreme controlling power in the sovereign at home.

Where a society consists of several races, the sovereign power cannot, without certainty of tyranny, be placed in the hands of one part of the society. The supreme political power ought not to be exposed to social interests and influences. It should be identified with the State alone, and should control the forces which move society, and the motives which direct these forces. For society is

an institution for realising private ends, and the greatest happiness of the greatest number ; the State for the accomplishment of public ends, altogether distinct from, and comparatively indifferent to, the special interests of any individual, or class, or element, such as religion, or capital. When self-government has currency, and there is no supreme power to keep repulsive forces in combination, there can only be equality among equals. Hence, where there are several unequal races in a republic, the political domination of race over race is sure to arise. In itself this is an evil and a political enormity. Hence the races require a supreme power to secure their several rights. Without this supreme control, self-government slides into the independence of the several races, and this into anarchy. In South America, government never succeeded without the strong control of a supreme though distant power. Where that power was wanting, there have been wars of blood, of colour, and of race. The good governments have been those where despotism has been perfect, that is, where the problem of government has been given up. Where it has been tried, it has failed; whereas in the English colonies it has signally succeeded.

The exclusion of the Red-skins has been the safety of North America, and the introduction of the Blacks only fails to be a fatal evil because they are slaves. If they were free, there would be an end of freedom, both for them and for the whites. But this exclusion was possible only with Protestants. The Church must have resisted such a policy, and then the colonies would probably have assumed a totally different shape.

In comparing our American colonies with those of Spain, the advantages which the northern climate conferred on us must not be overlooked ; the moderate supply of the products of nature was a great benefit, for such products as are used without the preparation of art become injurious by too great abundance. Those are the really beneficial products which encourage and facilitate labour, but which also require the application of art and skill before they can be turned to account.

Whether we look at our colonial system from a religious or from a political point of view, the chief distinction we should make lies, as it seems to me, between real colonies where our own emigrants form the nation, and our Asiatic possessions, where we govern a foreign race. The benefit of our system, in those cases where a subject population is governed by a conquering race, depends on its continuance. Hence this benefit has not yet been manifested. For the rise of the new society in Asia has not yet been provided for by the destruction of the old. This is a process which we are only beginning. In time these possessions will exercise the same powerful reaction on the mother country which the others have already exerted.

But at present it would be difficult to find any effects that our possession of India has had upon us. Our method of home-government has not been affected by that of the East-India Company,

and the classes which the Company enriched, the highest middle class and the gentry, were on the whole conservative. Their increased strength was not an element of change in English society or policy. Thus has nature provided for the possibility of that permanence of our government of India, without which it would be of no profit or benefit to the Indian races.

But the centralisation of the Indian government consequent upon the abolition of the Company must produce new phenomena. The first of these will be an enormous strengthening of the power of the State; the second, an aggravation of parliamentary omnipotence. But this, probably, will cure itself. The anomaly of the same assembly governing absolutely in one place and constitutionally in another cannot last. Its lawful, constitutional character would be tainted by arbitrary power. A sovereign can combine the two because he can commit the several governments to distinct bodies—one responsible to him alone, like the Council of the Indies at Seville, the other responsible to the nation as well, like our Parliament. There was this distinction in France between the *parlements* and the *états provinciaux*. But a legislative body cannot so divide its power. The absurdity of the thing gives the first promise of cure, and the symptoms are already favourable; the House of Commons does not listen to Indian debates, and is always empty when they come on. Perhaps in time some scheme will be devised for the independent self-government of our Indian Presidencies, which will deprive our Parliament of its initiative power, and will leave it a *deus ex machina*, not intervening except when a *dignus vindice nodus* claims its interference.

Whatever happens, and however this most difficult problem of reconciling liberty with the government of a dependency peopled by a variety of distinct and inferior races may be solved, what we must desire, for the sake of religion, is that the oriental career of our country should extend beyond the destruction of Eastern politics, even to the demolition of Eastern society.

With our real colonies, which are inhabited chiefly by our own people, the case is exactly the reverse. Their freedom has prevented their doing much for the conversion of the heathen or refinement of savage life. For liberty is the term and aim of all government, not its principle and foundation. It should be present in germ at the foundation of the state, and should grow with its growth. The test of good government is the healthy development of liberty, not its present attainment. It must grow up harmoniously with the state of society, with the relations of classes to each other, and with the manners, customs, and legislation of the community.

In our relations with other races we must accommodate ourselves to a different society. We must strike a balance between our maturity and their minority; we cannot be so free from State control in our intercourse with them as in our intercourse with men of our own country. The State ought to step in for their protection with regulations which we would not tolerate at home. The motto

of the old colony of Massachusetts, "Come over and help us," ought to have been that of our colonial empire.

It is very difficult to determine how to deal with savage natives. If they remain hunters and fishers, they perish as our civilisation pushes forward; for as the new settlements dislodge them from their own grounds, they occupy those of other tribes, and internecine war is the result. If they settle down beside us to cultivate the land, our superiority sinks them to paupers. They can only be saved by a system like that of the Spaniards, which strictly determined their rights, and prevented their being made simply beasts of burden. The Spanish government of the Indies was for the good of the State, the English for that of the settlers; the former for fiscal purposes, the latter for commercial purposes. The crown can make its own laws, but trade will not submit to dictation. No protection, therefore, is possible, and no good is likely to arise for the poor natives from our colonies in savage countries. Besides, the Spanish practice of converting the natives and using their labour was so thoroughly contrary to English ideas, that Bacon knew of no alternative but either expelling the natives, or settling on uninhabited land.

By themselves the laws of trade and economy must ruin the natives, as soon as they came in contact with us, and establish an exchange between us. The promotion of our trade requires us to awaken new desires in them; indeed, these new desires are the inevitable consequences of new knowledge and new ideas. Their old manner of life does not suffice to satisfy these new ideas,—to purchase spirits, weapons, gunpowder, domestic animals, and medicine. As hunters they are destitute of stored wealth. The craving for the new commodities, irrespective of their immoral or dangerous character, must gradually exhaust their means. So the missionaries justly dread the contact. But they cannot prevent it without the closest alliance with and support of the civil power. But how can commerce tolerate such restrictions, or the missionary hold his own against the trader? "The first sight of the horse and his rider," says the Governor of Queensland, Sir George Bowen, "appears to strike a tribe of blacks, as yet ignorant of the white man's existence, with supernatural terror. . . . But superstitious fear is soon succeeded by bitter hostility. Mutual provocations between the races lead to mutual reprisals. The fiercer spirits among the native warriors fall before the superior arms and skill of the European, or are driven still further backwards into the unexplored wilderness. The milder natures sink ere long into the well-fed dependents of the colonists" (*Papers relative to the Affairs of Queensland*, p. 28).

But these colonies, however injurious to the natives, have been most advantageous in their reaction on the parent state. All colonies strengthen the element from which they originate in the home country: in Spain, the crown; in England, the middle class. In the former case, therefore, the influence was monarchical; in the latter, liberal. This is the natural character of colonial life. For in a colony the individual must rely more on himself, as the social power

is less organised, and there is less division of labour ; consequently the individual is a greater unit, and a weightier element of the mass, than in the mother country. This is why colonisation requires the habit of local independence, self-reliance, and self-government ; and why the contrary habit of expecting all things from the government, and of submitting to be counted only *en masse*, is so fatal to colonists. This is why the English and Germans succeed, and the French fail ; except when, like the Canadians, they flourish under English government. The Frenchman is so little independent, so extremely sociable, that he sinks to the level of the society about him when he lives in a savage country. So French colonists never settle but in towns.

Again : the force of old associations and traditions is lost in a colony ; and the national character is modified by the new circumstances, so different from those which helped to mould it at home, and especially by the mixture of races. Thus the conservative, poetical, reverential elements of home society are lost. In old countries there exist habits, customs, laws, even institutions and political forms, the origin of which were clear when they came into being, but are now forgotten. Such customs, therefore, look like anomalies, and have no reason to show for themselves, but are only continued through habit. In colonies there is nothing of the kind. No awe surrounds institutions of which all the colonists have seen the beginning, and which many helped to make. There is no obscurity in external law, nothing unconscious in internal habit. All things have a distinct intelligible purpose and reason. Hence arises a uniformity of law, and a certain rationalism, as the spiritual roots of law must be abandoned in the absence of a common national instinct, of primitive habits, prejudices, superstitions, and faith.

Hence colonies are naturally liberal. If they begin otherwise, they are soon drawn into this tendency by the mixture of races. The offspring of such mixture is always a dissolving and disturbing element in colonial society. The revolution, which afterwards extended to Spain, began in Spanish America. It broke out at the Isla de Loon (Cadiz), in the army which was ready to be shipped off for the reduction of the colonies, and thence it extended over Spain. In Spanish America, especially in Mexico, the half-bloods were often leaders against the pure Spaniards.

A colony goes through the same politico-physiological process as the mother country, only much more rapidly and much more thoroughly ; for the extreme forms of tyranny and democracy are more distinctly and absolutely developed where there is no long customary tradition, no class privileges, no social influence, no remains of the past, to counteract and modify them. Hence also aristocracy is contrary to the nature of colonial life. It is essentially opposed to absolutism, to equality, to levelling, and in most cases to enterprise, because it tries to exempt property from the developing, but possibly dissolving, effect of speculation and exchange. So England has never succeeded in creating a colonial

aristocracy. Yet Burke represented such an aristocracy to be of the utmost importance to Canada. It knits society together, it is equivalent to organisation, it is a strong conservative power,—the nurse of reverence, of respect, of the pride of submission, and of the dignity of obedience ; it is a reminder of all the moral lessons which political society teaches, a preacher of love for home, a bond of the influence of the family over its members, and of respect for ancestral reputation ; it is a storehouse of the invisible forces of society ; and thus it exactly supplies that in which colonies are defective,—it exalts their character and prolongs their existence.

Yet from the absence of aristocracy in the colonies we have derived great benefit. They have influenced us by going a-head so fast, by outstripping the old country, by developing principles which with us are trammelled with natural impediments, by holding out before our eyes a picture of that towards which we are going, and by realising tendencies which cannot be realised here. There has been a very close, though external, connexion between our intercourse with North America and the development of our industry. North America has consequently influenced the progress of our democracy, at least of our free trade. There is the same connexion between the American war and Irish emancipation, as the volunteers, by whose means the old tyranny was for the first time shaken, arose from that war. But there is a much more important connexion in another way.

In our colonies we first learnt to tolerate the Catholic Church. The conquest of Canada first knocked a hole in the system of the penal laws. There was a large French population, just conquered, of doubtful fidelity, whom it would have been madness to oppress in matters of religion. So religious liberty was given to the Canadians ; and while all the American colonies revolted two years after, the conquest we had secured by toleration remained faithful. The first relaxations in Ireland and in England immediately followed. It is beyond question that the natural influence of colonial life on religious liberty was of the highest consequence. This influence is still felt, but has nearly exhausted itself. As far as their action on the Imperial Government is concerned, the colonies have done all that they can do for our benefit.

We have not, therefore, much reason to lament the existence of two laws which the history of colonies seems to reveal—gradual emancipation and premature decline. Our colonies began under James I., when our power was least, when our country was most over-populated through the prevalence of grazing in lieu of tillage, when wages were lowest through the cheapening of the precious metals, and when civil and religious oppression was at its height. They have grown with the growth of the mother country, and have greatly contributed to her increase. From the days of Raleigh and Bacon they had a commercial character ; they were not founded, like the Spanish colonies, simply for gold ; they were fed, peopled, and developed in obedience to the pressure of economical considera-

tions—to get new and fertile lands, new objects of exchange, new markets, increase of shipping and trade, and a refuge for excess of population. The laws of political economy predominate over their whole fate, and are the first element to be studied in drawing their horoscope. The original Navigation Act was passed by the Long Parliament for the purpose of protecting and encouraging British and colonial shipping, in opposition to the Dutch. It was a tax levied by the nation on itself, to be repaid with interest in after times. Such protection may be desirable for the education and nursing of trade. It is a present loss, but it may easily be a future gain. It is seed sown in hope of a harvest. John de Witt foresaw that it would carry much of the trade of the Dutch into English hands.* Child calls the Navigation Act the Magna Charta, Anderson, the Palladium, of our English naval power. New regulations were made for the benefit of England at the expense of the colonies, but this was chiefly after 1688; and it was natural, for a policy of interests is carried out much more ruthlessly by a parliament than by a monarchical government, as it secures the selfish support of interested classes. Generally dependencies are more happy under absolute monarchy than the home country, because authority is necessarily divided and intercepted on its passage to them. This was the case with the provinces of the Roman Empire, and with the Spanish Indies. No wonder, therefore, that the American colonies, flourishing and loyal under the Stuarts, who founded them in consequence of distress and oppression at home, were less happy under the Georges, when we had secured good government at home. When the two evils were combined, when constitutional monarchy was enabled to be arbitrary, by means of the corruption through which George III. and Lord North held in obedience a subservient but omnipotent Parliament, the rebellion of the colonists was natural.

The economical benefit of colonies lasts only as long as the exceptional state of protection can be profitably maintained. The Navigation Act developed our trade at one time, but checked it at another, by diverting our traders from other branches of commerce with foreign countries. It was just at the time when America found that it was no longer her interest to remain dependent, and threw off her allegiance, that Adam Smith laid down the doctrine of free trade, and recommended the emancipation of the colonies, and that Tucker, who condemned the claims of the Americans, advised their emancipation for the sake of England. Townsend, the traveller, about the same time, gave the same advice to Spain, and Arthur

* "Permit me to lead your attention very far back—back to the Act of Navigation; the corner-stone of the policy of this country with regard to its colonies. Sir, that policy was from the beginning purely commercial; and the commercial system was wholly restrictive. It was the system of a monopoly. . . . The Act of Navigation attended the colonies from their infancy, grew with their youth, and strengthened with their strength. . . . Nothing in the history of mankind is like their progress" (Burke's Speech on American Taxation, *Works*, iii. 193-4).

Young to France. The money spent on her colonies, he said, if devoted to the cultivation of her own territory, would produce ten times as much.

We owe to our colonies (1) the development of our trade ; (2) the creation of our naval supremacy ; (3) the rise of true notions of political economy ; (4) the establishment of freedom of conscience. But what they have been powerful to effect they are not necessary to preserve. None of these things would suffer from their loss, though none would have existed had it not been for them. Our encouragement of the emancipation of the Spanish colonies, the abolition of slavery (for some of them), and the removal of the protective system, must lead to the gradual separation of the colonies. In our present course, we cannot long continue to give any commercial privileges to them ; and if we do nothing for them, we cannot go on exacting any thing of them. "Over and above the commerce which she might equally enjoy after separation, England derives little advantage, except in *prestige*, from her dependencies ; and the little she does derive is quite outweighed by the expense they cost her, and the dissemination they necessitate of her naval and military force."*

But it is not in the nature of things that we should emancipate them of our own mere motion. It will probably in all cases be their own act. But emancipated colonies have not a long or very brilliant future before them. They get through their political capital more rapidly than the mother country, for they do not begin at the beginning ; they start from a very advanced period of the nation's life, with a political vitality already considerably expended ; they live, as they thrive, very quickly ; and they have not the retarding, balancing, restraining forces at work in them which prolong the existence of old states. Political and social decline is consequently more rapid with colonies than with parent states, while they retain the colonial character, that is, while they continue a part of the old people.

To begin a new development, with the whole of natural life before them, they must divest themselves of the colonial character, and become, by the mixture of races, a new nationality. Then they can put forth all the natural forms of national and political life, and proceed through the natural phases from childhood to old age. This formation of new nations has only commenced in California and in the eastern states of America. There are few signs of it in our colonies in general, and it has been tried and has failed in the colonies of Spain.

But whatever their future destiny, the European colonies have peopled America and Australia with a Christian population, and have broken down European intolerance. For the future the religious interest is centred chiefly in our Asiatic empire.

C. C.

* J. S. Mill on Representative Government, p. 325.

DELTATION.

SIR,—Mr. Tricoupi, the historian of the Greek revolution, thinks that the Turkish government of Greece was much to blame for its habit of dispensing with the services of spies. It was for want of these “lights of the State,” he thinks, that it lost Greece. But although the Turkish contempt for espionage arose rather from a sense of duty and of honour than from any calculation, it has been a good stroke of policy, and has done much for the preservation of the Ottoman Empire. The absence of any systematic scheme of espionage made a large party of Greeks think the Sultan’s government preferable to that of Venice or of Austria, or even to that of their friend the Czar. Who shall decide between these spy-hating Greeks and Mr. Tricoupi? Who shall balance the unpopularity against the utility of the system? Unless, indeed, we go to the bottom of the question, and ask whether, on Christian principles, the system is right and allowable, or the reverse?

The severest punishment of spies and *delatores* was enacted by those governments which had most fostered them, and which most depended upon their services. Among the Roman Emperors, Domitian made himself most conspicuous, both for his employment and his punishment of spies. It is perhaps from his own contributions to this title of the civil law that the old canon is drawn.* *Delatori autem lingua capuletur, aut convicto caput amputetur*,—“Let the delator have his tongue pierced; or if convicted [of accusing falsely], let him have his head cut off.” Thus our old nursery rhyme, like others of its class, is not destitute of venerable authority—“Tell-tale-tit, your tongue shall be slit, and all the dogs in the town shall have a little bit.” In process of time the severity of this early law grew distasteful to the canonists, and they softened it by “mystical” interpretations.

Let the *delator*, they said, if a clergyman, have his tongue tied, and be reduced to silence; and let his head, that is his dignity, be taken from him. If he is a layman, let him do penance, by standing in perpetual silence, in some church; and let him lose his rank, or, if he has none, let him be made infamous.

The delation, which the canon law, in accordance with the judgment of all honourable men, thus reckons infamous, is a *private* information. The grievance of it is its secrecy. The delator, says a French definition, is a *secret* accuser, who fears publicity and evidence. And to show how degrading his business was reckoned, the Parisians had a stock-story about a person of this profession marrying a fallen woman, who, after some time, found out how her husband supported himself, and forthwith hanged herself for very shame, that her marriage, which she thought had restored her respectability, had only degraded her below what she was before.

* Cap. Delatori, v. quest. ult.

The secrecy of informations was effectually provided against by Innocent III., who, in his decree *Qualiter, de accusationibus* (Dec. lib. v.), admits only three modes of proceeding for the correction of faults,—accusation, denunciation, and inquisition. “But in all,” he says, “great care must be taken, lest by too great haste we speed ill. As before accusation there must be the inscription prescribed by law, so before denunciation there must be charitable admonition, and before inquisition public rumour.”

The man who took upon himself to be an accuser was obliged by this law to sign his name to a deed, which bound him, if he failed to prove his case, to suffer the same penalty which the man whom he accused would have to suffer if condemned.* This “inscription” was a strong barrier against secrecy. Inquisition, on the other hand, was originally a process by which the truth or falsehood of current reports against persons was investigated. Here there was no particular accuser; common report was the ground of the proceeding, and was the substitute for a definite accusation. The object of the accuser was to procure the exemplary punishment of the guilty; that of the inquisitor was originally simply to find out the truth. And thirdly, the only recognised object of denunciation, the act of the delator, was the amendment of the person denounced. Hence, as Innocent III. ordered, charitable admonition must always precede denunciation. The man who knows of his brother’s secret fault must always try to correct it by private persuasion before he proceeds to denounce him to his superior.

St. Thomas† goes deeply into the reasons why brotherly admonition must always go before denunciation. Sins, he says, are either public or secret. When they are public, we have not only to correct the sinner, but to see that others are not scandalised; such sins, therefore, are to be punished publicly, according to the text, 1 Tim. v. 20. But if the sins are secret, then we must follow our Lord’s directions in Matt. xviii.: “If thy brother sin against thee,” &c. If he offends you publicly, he sins not against you only, but against the others also whom he scandalises. But if his offence is private, it may still be to the damage of others. For there are secret faults which may result in a public calamity; as when a man secretly plots to betray the State, or secretly tries to pervert others to heresy. And since such a man sins not against you only, but against others also, you ought at once to denounce him, so as to prevent the hurt that might ensue, unless you think that you can effectually prevent it by secret admonition.

But there are sins which only hurt the sinner, or the person against whom he sins, whether directly or by his ill example. And then the only object should be to help the erring brother; and, like a surgeon who cures, if he can, without cutting off the limb, or with the smallest amputation consistent with the preservation of life, he who tries to mend his brother ought, if possible, to heal the con-

* See St. Thomas. Sum. 2da 2dæ, q. 68, art. 4.

† Sum. 2da 2dæ, q. 33, art. 7.

science without damaging the reputation. For good report is necessary to a man, not only in the temporal sphere, but in the spiritual sphere also. How many abstain from sin for fear of losing their good fame ! When such persons have once lost their fame, they will give themselves up to sin. Still, as conscience is to be preferred to good report, it is God's will that the conscience should be freed from sin by public denunciation, even with the loss of fame. Hence it is clear that God's law obliges us (*ex necessitate præcepti*) to admonish secretly before we denounce publicly.

Having thus explained the principle, St. Thomas solves the chief arguments brought against it. A text from Genesis xxxvii. is quoted : "Joseph accused his brethren to his father of a vile offence." St. Thomas replies, "We must suppose that Joseph had previously admonished his brothers, or, at any rate, that the crime was publicly known among them." Another argument was, "It does not seem likely that the common custom of convents should be contrary to the law of Christ ; and this common custom is in the chapters to tell each other's faults without any previous private admonition." St. Thomas replies, that "these accusations in chapter are about trifling affairs which do not hurt a man's reputation, and are rather reminders of forgotten defects than denunciations or accusations. But if they were such as to damage reputation, it would be against the law of God thus to denounce them." Another argument is, "Monks are bound to obey their superiors. But superiors sometimes order all the monks, or some one specially, to tell them every thing he knows of, that wants correcting. Therefore it seems they are bound to tell, even without secret admonition." St. Thomas answers, "No superior is to be obeyed in opposition to God's law. 'We ought to obey God rather than men.' Therefore when a superior commands his monks to tell him whatever faults they know of, we must interpret the command in conformity with the duty of brotherly correction, whether the command is given to all or to one in particular. But if the superior gives an express command in contradiction to this law of God, he sins in giving the command ; and the man who obeys him sins also, as acting against the commandment of God. So that he ought not to be obeyed. For the superior is not judge of secret matters, but only God ; and therefore he has no power to make any law about secret matters, till they become notorious, or suspected ; in which case a religious superior can investigate the affair in the same way as a civil judge."

In the first reply to the arguments of the next article,* St. Thomas says, "Some suppose that the following order is to be observed in administering brotherly correction. First, the brother is to be secretly admonished : if he listens, well ; if not, then, if the sin is altogether secret, nothing more is to be done ; but if it is beginning to ooze out, we must go on to do what our Lord prescribes" (*i.e.* take one or two witnesses, and tell it to the Church). "But this is contrary to what Augustine says in his rule—'a brother's sin

* 2da 2dæ, q. 33, art. 8, ad 1.

should not be concealed, lest it corrupt in the heart.' Therefore we must say that after secret admonition, given one or more times, we must still proceed in the same course while we have any probable hope of amendment; but as soon as we have probable reason to think that secret admonition will be of no avail, we must go on to produce our witnesses, even though the sin should be hidden. Unless we think that this course will not avail to correct our brother, but will only make him worse, in which case we must give up the business altogether."

The authorities I have quoted condemn all private delation, and only allow public denunciation of a private fault when the guilty person has proved incorrigible by private persuasion. There are only two exceptions. First, when the private fault threatens to damage the commonwealth or the Church; then denunciation becomes a duty of self-defence, just as homicide might under analogous circumstances; and secondly, when the private fault is so utterly insignificant that the reputation and the respect in which a man is held lose nothing by its publication. Hence it must follow that denunciation without the previous admonition, or delation, is oftener a sin than a permissible act. But as the habit of tale-bearing must be more apt to run into indiscriminate delation, than carefully to weigh what may be told, and what ought to be concealed, such a habit will probably result in acts which in nine cases out of ten are sinful. Hence I should think that it would be much better to introduce a system where this habit should find no place, than to patronise the habit because it happens to be necessary for a system which happens to exist. The spy system is capable of defence, as being necessary for the preservation of despotic governments; but it is much better logic to condemn despotisms for making spies necessary. If secret delation is sometimes morally indifferent, it is much oftener morally sinful. And the habit that each act of the kind tends to produce and to strengthen is always a temptation and an occasion of sin, and is as infamous and disreputable politically and socially as it is morally degrading.

V. P.

Literary Notices.

History of the Greek Revolution. By G. Finlay. 2 vols. (Blackwood, 1861.) These volumes conclude the series of valuable works in which Mr. Finlay traces the fortunes of the Greeks from the Roman conquest to the establishment of constitutional independence. Almost simultaneously with them there has been published the first part of a *History of the Greek Revolution*, in the fifth volume of the *History of the Nineteenth Century*, by Gervinus. The two works usefully complete each other, inasmuch as our countryman possesses an unrivalled knowledge of the scenes and of the events he describes,

and of the modern Hellenic literature ; whilst the German writes from a higher and remoter point of view, thinks less of Greece and more of Europe in general, and brings to light much new information respecting the negotiations of the great powers. In the mind of Mr. Finlay, familiarity with the people of Greece has bred an unbounded contempt. He neglects no opportunity of confirming from his own observation the disparaging estimate of the Greek character, which he has adopted from Polybius, at the opening of his second volume. "Not to mention other defects, no Greek who is intrusted with public money can refrain from peculation, even if ten commissioners be appointed to watch over the expenditure, and though ten bonds be signed, with twice as many witnesses, as a security for his honesty." Baseness, avarice, treachery, disfigure almost every scene in the war of deliverance. It is strange that a people so sordid should have accomplished an insurrection so ideal in its motives and its aims. The most powerful incentives to armed resistance—the oppression of one race by another, and of one religion by another—were less active in Greece than in many European states. The despotism of the pashas was for many reasons less heavy on the Greeks than on the Turks. The country peasantry were raised by the Turkish conquest to a position which was one of freedom and independence, in comparison with that which they had under the Byzantine emperors and the Franks. The vices of the Greeks singularly adapted them for service under the Ottoman rule, and by becoming its instruments they found compensation for its oppression in sharing the power and the profits of the oppressors. "A wicked government," says Mr. Finlay (i. 128), "requires unprincipled agents; and during the whole of the eighteenth century the Greeks held several important offices in the Sultan's government, because they were without principle." Thousands of wealthy Greeks held aloof from the revolution, and pursued their own interests under Turkish protection.

The result of the conflict was to destroy and depopulate the land, and to introduce for a time an anarchy the most frightful, says Mr. Finlay, that ever desolated a Christian country in modern times. Nor was the intolerance of the Mussulmans more galling than the despotism of the Sultan. Many of the Christian races abandoned the Greeks, and many of the Greeks who dwelt out of their own country were indifferent to the efforts of their countrymen. The hatred of Islam was feeble compared to the hatred of Rome. The Turkish domination, said the patriarch Anthimos, was a salutary safeguard against the Latin heresy. So far was it from being a purely religious war, that in the action at Mesolonghi, in which Botzaris fell, the force of the Greeks was composed of Moslems, and the Turkish army of Catholics. The impulse was partly, indeed, given by the clergy, when the Philike Hetairia gave promise of Russian support; and then their hopes were not of independence, but of a change of masters. This was from no national feeling or hatred of oppression, for the prelates themselves were forced by

simony and the condition of their finances to be among the oppressors of their countrymen. "A bishop," says Mr. Finlay, "could hardly avoid acting like a Turk in office." But though the prospect of becoming subjects of Russia exercised a charm on the Greek priesthood, and although Russia has derived the chief advantage of the Greek revolution, yet it was not a fruit of Russian intrigue. At the time when the outbreak occurred, it was not at all welcome to the Russian government, which was then preponderating in the councils of the Holy Alliance. Although, during the invasion of Russia in 1812, the Emperor Alexander recognised as legitimate the the Spanish Cortes and their constitution, yet in 1822, at the height of the reaction, Count Nesselrode denounced it as disastrous and absurd; and the Emperor explained to Chateaubriand that his dynastic interests would be particularly served by a war for the defence of the Greeks, but that he discerned in their rising revolutionary symptoms, and was resolved in consequence to hold back. Even in 1830 Count Nesselrode called it, in private instructions for the Grand Duke Constantine, "the deplorable revolution of 1821."

The Greeks neither deserved their independence nor acquired it themselves. The real significance of the event lies, not in their character or achievements, but in the motives and the consequences of the European intervention. It was the first practical refutation of the legitimist doctrine, the first breach opened in the system of the Holy Alliance. Whilst the Austrians were suppressing the revolution in Italy, and the French in Spain, the cause of the Greeks inspired a sympathy which even Metternich could not withstand; and the principle, that the badness of a government is no reason for upsetting it, had to be abandoned first in the case of the Turks. The precedent was afterwards successfully invoked by the Belgians; and when the Poles appealed to it, they enjoyed the secret but ardent good wishes even of the Austrian statesmen. The conservative principle of the rightfulness of the *status quo*, in its absolute and revolutionary form, in the moment of its triumph at Verona and Cadiz, was destroyed for ever by the Greeks. But it fell, not to make way for a truer notion of right and wrong, but to be supplanted by a new error, which has since proved equally powerful and equally hostile to right and freedom. It was a victory gained not by the right of resistance, or by toleration, or by law against an arbitrary despotism, but by the principle of nationality. Beginning with the rebellion of Ali Pasha in the Adriatic provinces of Turkey, who cared neither for Moslem, Catholic, or Greek, it was carried to its successful end by the western powers, under the belief that the people of Hellas and Morea were the descendants of those to whom European civilisation owes so much. Greece had fallen before the Turks, because the hatred of the Latins was stronger than the love of national independence, and she recovered her freedom when religious differences were hidden in the plea of nationality. Whilst the western powers pursued this chimera, the influence of Russia was founded on the firm basis of dogmatic agreement, and prevailed

in consequence of the reluctance of the other powers, whose classical sympathies were bounded by Thessaly, to give to the new kingdom the means of real independence.

The Philhellenic enthusiasm in Europe, nay, the Hellenic patriotism of the Greeks, was an offshoot of the revival of classical studies at the end of the eighteenth century. Greek students at Jena heard Schiller exalt the glories of their country, and exhort them to deliver it. Coraes, a Greek living among the philologists of Paris, edited the Classics with fervid patriotic prefaces and notes. This antiquarian influence was not without effect; for in Greece, Mr. Finlay tells us (i. 20), a larger proportion could read and write than among any other Christian race in Europe. The Church had kept alive through her service the memory of the ancient language. Corrupted in the pronunciation and in some of the forms, it was less changed than any other European tongue; and the scholarly character of the revolution has had the effect of restoring the purity of the idiom, so that the common people can hardly understand the Greek of the last generation in which the memoirs of Colocotronis are written. On this identity of language, the favourite test of the historians of a former age, the belief in the identity of the modern with the ancient Greeks was founded. To the people themselves, with whom, before the revolution, the ancient Greeks were a mythical race of giants and demigods, the belief in their descent became an axiom, borrowed from the Philhellenes. The first article of the constitution of East Hellas, in 1822, declares that "all the present inhabitants of Greece who believe in Christ are Hellenes." Attentive travellers, like Gell, observed, indeed, a great difference between the races on the mainland and in the islands; but no scientific investigation of the question was made until the sympathies of Europe had been successfully invoked by the Greeks. Then, when the classical enthusiasm had fulfilled its mission, and the imagination of Europe was filled with the verses and the fate of its greatest poet, cold-hearted scholars began to discover and to expose the fallacy on which the Philhellenic ardour was founded. In the instructions given by the Paris librarian Hase to the French expedition to the Morea, after the battle of Navarino, he expressed the opinion that the Hellenic population of the Peloponnesus was expelled by Slavonic immigrants in the eighth century. When Bavaria sent forth a king and an army to take possession of Greece, a Bavarian professor, till then unknown, but famous since as the only historian whom for the union of eloquence, scepticism, learning, and malignity his countrymen can compare to Gibbon, proclaimed and established in a series of brilliant works that the only true descendants of the Greeks survive in the Ionian Islands, on the coast of Anatolia, and among the Phanariots at Constantinople; the very people to whom independence has been denied. Fallmerayer's opinion, which was bitterly attacked at the time, and which his character did as much to injure as his ability had done to establish, has prevailed at last. But for the rage for an imaginary nationality, it would have found

less resistance, as the mixture of blood is one of the conditions of the greatness of nations.

Aids to Faith. A series of Theological Essays by several Writers; edited by William Thompson, D.D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. (Murray.)—*Replies to Essays and Reviews*; with a Preface by the Lord Bishop of Oxford. (John Henry Parker.)—*Examination of Prevalent Opinions on Inspiration*; with Introduction by the Rev. H. B. Wilson. The question mooted by the "Essayists and Reviewers" takes two forms in minds variously constituted. To the Anglican churchman it is, "To whom is the Bible committed, and who is to interpret it?" To the Protestant who has no church, it is, "What is the true interpretation of the Bible?" At the time of the Reformation, says Mr. Haddan, the writer of the sixth "Reply," the innovators attacked "the Church such as it had grown to be without the Bible;" while the modern innovators attack "the Bible, such as men have made it without the Church." Such apologists, with the Bishop of Oxford, appeal to authority, and invoke the "severe censures" of the Church of England upon the Essayists. But they know that their arguments will not touch those against whom they are invented. "The Churchman's defence," says Mr. Irons, "will not avail the merely literary believer." "Mere denials and protests," says Dr. Goulburn, "will avail little or nothing;" the only way of reclaiming the innovators is by "a candid acknowledgment of those truths after which the Essayists are groping." The other antagonists of the Essayists do not make this appeal to authority, but they have a clearer view of the position into which the Reformation put the Church of England. They see how impossible it is to defend that Church for having transferred the Bible from the hands of the Catholic Church to the private piety of the sectarians, and at the same time to refute the modern innovators, who wish in turn to take it out of the hands of these blind devotees, and to intrust it to the enlightened criticism of sceptical scholars. They therefore accept the controversy as it is proposed to them by the Essayists, and critically examine what is the true interpretation of the Bible.

This discussion has several branches. The idea of inspiration, the human or historical element in Scripture, and the rights of criticism in relation to writings claiming to be inspired; the signs of inspiration, miracles and prophecy; and the doctrines which are revealed in the Scripture: all these are points which the Essayists have attacked, and which have been defended with more or less success by their answerers.

Those of the replies which take the ground of the authority of the Anglican Establishment are singularly wild. Mr. Irons argues with much ability on Catholic principles, and concludes, not with proving that they are the principles of the Establishment, but with demanding that the Establishment should be "adjusted" to them. Mr. Cook, who writes in the *Aids to Faith*, enunciates the curious theory that the Anglican layman is one "whose opinions are in

process of formation," while the clergyman is one whose mind is made up on all essential points : hence one signs the Thirty-nine Articles, the other does not. Dr. Goulburn and Dr. Wordsworth, having no critical faculty of their own, naturally take the side of authority, which they back up with heavy writing. Dr. Wordsworth, indeed, is worse than heavy ; his affected pleasantry and laboured jocularity make him offensive as well as tedious.

Of the Essays on the evidences, that by Mr. Mansel on Miracles, in *Aids to Faith*, is incomparably the best. Dr. M'Caul on Prophecy, and Mr. Rawlinson on the Pentateuch, are learned, but not very logical. After the summary way in which Mr. Rose in one volume, and Dr. M'Caul in another, condemn the German critics because they do not agree together, it is instructive to compare Dr. M'Caul's interpretation of Genesis i. in one volume with Mr. Rorison's in the other. One begins with proving that it is poetry, the other that it is not poetry ; one argues that the first verse describes a distinct event, the other that it is merely a summary of the chapter ; and so on.

Of the Essays on particular doctrines, that by Dr. Thompson on the Sufferings of Christ is excellent. Indeed, this and Mr. Mansel's are the only two of any permanent value. Those on Inspiration in both volumes are painfully deficient ; and this is the most important of the questions raised. As Mr. Wilson puts it in his introduction to the *Examination*, it is " whether in the Scriptures God has revealed Himself mediately or immediately ; by a supernatural process, or through a natural but no less divine order." This is a studiously insufficient way of expressing the doubt, which extends not only to inspiration but to grace. The worst features of Pelagianism are being reproduced by a school which every where explains the supernatural order to be a mere natural development of the natural order, and admits no real distinction between the laws of nature and the laws of God's supernatural dealings with men. Mr. Baden Powell was the most offensive writer of this school, because he uttered what he meant without circumlocution. The other Essayists shared his openness of speech. Mr. Maurice, Mr. Goldwin Smith, and hosts of others, belong intellectually to the same school, though they overlay their theory with plentiful expressions of reverence and religiosity, which seem strangely out of place when applied to matters merely human. This part of the controversy is most successfully, though indirectly, dealt with by Mr. Mansel.

Of the two volumes we have noticed, the *Aids to Faith* is far the best. It contrasts both with the *Essays* and with the *Replies* in the manly way in which Dr. Thompson accepts the responsibility of the whole volume, and leaves each contributor to answer only for his own Essay. The Bishop of Oxford, on the contrary, professes not to have read the volume for which he writes the preface, and in consequence, he entirely misrepresents the spirit of the *Replies* which he edits. In one thing both volumes contrast ominously with the *Essays*,—in the absence of any deep and unconscious unity of pur-

pose. The instances where the writers flatly contradict each other are innumerable.

The City of the Saints, and across the Rocky Mountains to California. By Richard F. Burton, author of "A Pilgrimage to El Medinah and Meccah." (London : Longmans.) This remarkable book contains the best account of the religion and the institutions of the Mormons, and of the phenomena of their social life. As an observer, Mr. Burton has the advantage of not being a Christian, or, at least, of very successfully concealing it, if he is one. "All knowledge concerning man," says one of the most eminent of the Catholic medieval philosophers, "consists in two things : in the knowledge of what ought to be, and the knowledge of what is—of duty and of fact. And the knowledge of duty ought to come before the knowledge of fact, because it is only a kind of light to know the fact by ; for we cannot know the fact, whether it is as it ought to be or not, unless we first know the duty. For the duty is the measure, and rule, and law, of the fact. He, therefore, who knows not the duty, knows not the fact." Then the philosopher appeals to experience : "that all our doing, both inside us and outside us, and all our leaning, is quite against duty, or the right and law of nature" (Raymund de Sabunde, *Natural Theology*, part v. tit. cexxiii. p. 346).

There are two consequences from this doctrine. First, that we must not get our notions of duty from history ; for history only tells us what is, and what is utilitarian, but can never tell us what ought to be. And, secondly, that we must not get our notions of fact from our notions of duty, because, as Raymund says, fact is clean contrary to duty. Now, in the case of a set of men who have swallowed so monstrous a hoax as the Mormon revelation, and who have been such traitors to the laborious result of European and Christian civilisation as to reëstablish polygamy in more than Asiatic redundancy, the rebellion against duty is so obvious and so horrible, that it is difficult for any decent man who goes to look at them so to master his ideas of right as not to let them modify, in many respects, his view of the fact. Accordingly, the "Gentile" writers, who have up to this time been our authorities for the internal economy of Mormon life, are accused by Mr. Burton, and with apparent reason, of monstrous partiality, and of a greedy and uncritical acceptance of all current scandals. Mr. Burton not having, or at least not showing, any undue bias either way, is able to weigh, in equal scales, the competitive claims of monogamy, polygamy, and polyandry, to the favour of the human race, in a way that, while it has its attractions to the physical inquirer or the historian, must banish his book, in spite of the lightness of its general contents, from well-conditioned drawing-rooms.

Not that Mr. Burton is a historian any more than Mr. Buckle, whom he admires so greatly. He is an excellent traveller, whose observing powers are first-rate, but whose reasoning powers are

small. With an abundance of energy, and a determination to make any condition of life that is tolerable permanently to any class of human beings tolerable to him for a time, while he makes the experiment of it, Mr. Burton has been able to assume characters that other travellers shrink from assuming, and to visit and live among people that other travellers would either not be permitted, or would not be able to prevail upon themselves, to live amongst. And while dwelling among these various specimens of human nature, if he has not lived their life, he has at least always made himself an advocate of their mode of living, partly by showing how the evil consequences of their systems are counteracted in practice, but chiefly by retorts and *tu quoque* arguments addressed to his readers. Thus he rebukes Christians who are shocked at the Mormon "plurality," by reproaching them with the great social evil of most Christian cities, from which he says Utah is entirely free. Thus also politicians, who detest the prying of the prophet into all the private concerns of the sojourners in the City of the Saints, have to digest the retort that they had better look at home, to the Post-office of Paris, and even of London, when there are rumours of treason afloat. Not an abuse of Mormonism can be cited for which he has not one of these isolated and unconnected authorities in some degenerate Christian practice.

After clearing away all these flippant pleas, which will convince nobody, there remain two points on which Mr. Burton's evidence is of great value. First and chiefly, the state of Mormon society and opinion, the morals, manners, and customs of the followers of Brigham Young. Mr. Burton seems to have been allowed more unrestrained intercourse with them than other Gentiles, probably because a reputed Turk would be less suspected of abominating their peculiar institutions than a Christian. Thus he saw more; and, as he saw all with unruffled equanimity, he describes it more fairly. The second point on which his evidence is valuable, though to a less degree, is the Mormon belief. The documents of the sect are open to any one who chooses to spend a few shillings in buying them; but Mr. Burton's study of them was helped by intercourse with Mormon doctors, by a knowledge of the history of their development, by the general atmosphere of opinion in the "City of the Saints," and by a habit of throwing his mind into strange forms of religious belief. He has a practical acquaintance with Brahminism, perhaps with Buddhism, and an intimate knowledge of Mahometanism; and to all these systems he finds points of resemblance in Mormonism. If he had a better historical knowledge of the dead religions of Persia and Egypt, and of those of the Gnostic sects, he would have been able to draw out his proof of the recurring character of forms of belief much more fully. The Mormon faith deserves investigation, not only because it has revived among an illiterate mob the cloudy dreams of old Oriental mysticism, in combination with the hardest materialism of modern positive schools; but also because it has given rise to a kind of pagan sect, in legitimate descent from Pro-

testant and Methodist fanaticism, and has spontaneously reproduced among Anglo-Saxons, generally so averse from hierarchical institutions, a community in which a Popedom, an Apostolic succession, a system of surveillance ten times more rigid than any that was ever plausibly attributed to the confessional, and the temporal sovereignty of an autocratic and theocratic pontiff, are necessary elements of the common creed, and articles of a standing or falling church.

The Early Italian Poets, from Ciullo d'Alcamo to Dante (1100 to 1300); together with *Dante's Vita Nuova*. Translated by D. G. Rossetti.—*The Vita Nuova of Dante*, with Introduction and Notes. By Theodore Martin.—*Romantic Episodes*. Translated by Alexander Vance.—*Story of King Arthur and his Knights of the Round Table*. (Griffith and Farran). We put these four books together because they are all connected with a revived interest in, or curiosity about, the ages of chivalry. The last volume is a kind of drawing room or school-room edition of a round of romances, which are worth more when transfigured by Tennyson into Idylls than in their raw state. The third consists of a series of short tales, histories, and moral extracts, from writers of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, many of them outside the chivalrous age. The two first volumes carry us into the very heart of chivalry, which they exhibit in its most interesting phase—in its philosophy of love. Mr. Theodore Martin, however successfully he may have rendered the abandonment and the passion of Catullus, has failed in translating the mystical and measured love of Dante. Catullus speaks in the tones of nature; Dante forces nature into the mould of a philosophy, which Mr. Martin has not given himself the trouble to understand. A person who can translate the words "*in potenza ed in atto*" by "in its powers and in its actions," is clearly unfit to interpret the philosophic poet of Italy; and he is so conscious of this, that in his introductory essay he strives to prove that the *Vita Nuova* is no recondite essay on mystical science, but a plain narrative of an ordinary courtship. Mr. Rossetti is the son of the celebrated Professor Rossetti, whose ingenious attempts to give a political meaning to all Dante's allegories were so fiercely assailed some thirty-five years ago: he has therefore a sort of traditional knowledge of the poet. He has kept his translation by him for years, gradually improving and perfecting it, and has at last given us a volume which is exceedingly interesting both historically and poetically.

The circle of Italian poets of whom Mr. Rossetti gives us specimens forms, perhaps, the only European lay literature of its epoch (1100 to 1300). The subject on which they usually write is love; but in their hands love was so universal a philosophy that it came to mean any thing in the whole range of science and politics. But many of the poems have a direct political bearing; some are directed against the rage for voluntary poverty that distinguished the era of St. Francis. Others are simply expressions of joviality or of cynicism. Guido Guinicelli, the greatest of the precursors of

Dante, writes about "moderation and tolerance" as a modern would. The volume gives great insight into medieval life in Italy.

Lives of the Engineers. By Samuel Smiles. (London : Murray.) The object of Mr. Smiles, who is already known to the public by his *Life of George Stephenson* and his very successful work *Self-Help*, in these two handsomè volumes, is to give "an account of some of the principal men by whom the material development of England has been promoted," by reclaiming land for cultivation, forming the internal communications of the country, and lighting up its coasts.

It comes out in the course of the volumes, especially in the chapter on "Early Roads and Modes of Travelling," vol. i., and in the first chapter of the life of Rennie, in vol. ii., that there have been two periods of a great material civilisation in England and Scotland, separated by a period of barbarism, which began with the change of religion in the sixteenth century. In the latter chapter especially Mr. Smiles contrasts what Dr. Johnson somewhere calls "the sleepy laziness of the men that erected churches," bridges, roads, and all that was required for active national life, "with the fervid activity of those who suffered them to fall," in a way that is quite as striking as Mr. Buckle's indictment against the all-destroying fanaticism of the Scotch Presbyterians in the second volume of his *Civilisation*, and which is, at the same time, much more valuable, because it is written without prejudice or predetermined purpose. The monks, in the former period of national wealth, were the great workmen, and the reconcilers of industry with religious occupation. After them came a period of misery and degradation, under the ignoble rule of the low-born and low-bred teachers of Protestantism. And this period was succeeded by one in which, through such men as Mr. Smiles describes in these volumes, industry was restored, not now as a religious occupation, but as in itself the highest aim of the human intellect and soul. Not that Mr. Smiles would avowedly divorce it from religion ; but he seems to contemplate engineering success in its results, and to make it the highest manifestation of love for man, and therefore of love for God, because it is productive of the greatest convenience and benefit to society in general ; because it saves life, mitigates want, economises labour, and provides leisure for self-improvement.

Words can hardly be too enthusiastic in praise of the social and economical merits of the men who have given us these splendid results, in giving us the power of gaining them. The only thing we counsel their admirers to avoid is, the assumption that these works necessarily imply the moral and spiritual eminence of the soul whose intellect plans them, or that it is impossible to be at once a benefactor to the whole world in public, and a godless sensualist in private.

Current Events.

HOME AFFAIRS.

THE shadow of our great national bereavement still hangs over the land, but the twofold gloom under which the year opened was in part dispelled, on the 9th of January, by the arrival of intelligence that the Government of the United States had disavowed the act of Captain Wilkes, the commander of the *San Jacinto*, and had consented to surrender Messrs. Mason and Slidell. As this surrender was the only essential portion of our own demand, the war which had seemed imminent was at once put out of the question, and renewed confidence succeeded to that vague sense of approaching calamity which for some weeks had pervaded the public mind.

No disparagement to Lord Russell's diplomacy is involved in the admission that its fortunate issue was hardly less due to the warlike preparations by which it was supported than to its own courtesy and firmness. The capture of the Southern envoys had only become known in England on the 27th of November; the demand for reparation was despatched on the 30th; and it was instantly determined to double the strength of our squadron on the coast of North America, and to send out a force of 12,000 men for the defence of the Canadian provinces. Within ten days after the Government had come to this decision, the first troops had embarked; at the end of three more weeks, the whole force had left our shores, provided with all the appliances of war, down to the minutest working detail. The responsibility of carrying out these measures devolved on Lord de Grey, and the country will not fail to appreciate the remarkable difficulty of the task, or the perfect success with which it was accomplished. The troops carried with them 66,000 rifles, 10,000 muskets, 71,000 sets of accoutrements, 15 million rounds of ammunition, 40,000 great-coats, 36,000 blankets, 15,000 suits of warm clothing, two complete 12-pounder batteries, 1 9-pounder battery, 30 sledges, with harness com-

plete, forge and hand carts, spare tumbrils and ambulance wagons, scaling ladders, entrenching tools, tools for sappers, hospital stores and bedding for purveyors, 400 cases of medical comforts, hospital clothing, 25 pairs of litters, 150 pack-saddles, 6 hospital wagons, an electric telegraph with wires, batteries, and instruments, and a large number of 100-pounder Armstrong guns, with carriages and platforms complete, upwards of 1000 tons of gunpowder, 1000 solid shot for the North American squadron, 5000 32-pounder naval shells, and 5000 10-inch naval shells. Besides this, every battalion took 1 marquee, 2 hospital tents, 130 circular tents, 1800 blankets, 900 canteens, 180 camp-kettles, 2 medicine chests, 900 surgical bandages, 900 cholera-belts, 70 hatchets, 2 pack-saddles, 10 spades, 10 shovels, 16 pick-axes, 20 felling-axes, 6 saws, 6 files, 12 whetstones, 10 hammers, and 20 wedges. The whole of this enormous equipment was completed in thirty days; and within a nearly identical period the fleet under Admiral Milne, consisting of 5 line-of-battle ships, 10 frigates, and 17 corvettes and sloops, mounting in all 850 guns, received an addition of 2 line-of-battle ships, 23 frigates, and 8 corvettes, mounting in all 1000 guns.

The chord thus struck by the energy of ministers vibrated through the country. The naval reserve, which has risen to 9000 men, since the absurd and worse than ineffectual bounty was superseded by adequate pay, volunteered with alacrity at all the chief stations. The great shipping and railway companies placed their means of transport at the disposal of the public departments, without any stipulation as to price. The local authorities at the ports of embarkation vied with the Government officials in eager anxiety for the success of the expedition. And throughout the Volunteer force, which, in its different arms—Infantry, Artillery, Engineers,

and Light-Horse—now numbers upwards of 150,000 men, the prospect of actual service in defence of our own shores was welcomed with enthusiasm; while some of its members even, overlooking in their exuberant patriotism the object and conditions of their service, offered to take part with the regular troops in the hardships and dangers of an American campaign.

Meanwhile the Canadians were not less active in their own defence, or less hearty in the expression of their loyalty to the crown, while they differed from their fellow-subjects here in manifesting an actual desire for war with the United States, even though their own country was to be the field of battle. In addition to 7,500 of the active militia, about 35,000 of the sedentary militia were called out; and the volunteer corps mustered a force of 20,000 men. As soon as the news of Captain Wilkes's exploit arrived, Sir Fenwick Williams, who commanded the troops in the colony, paid a visit of inspection to all the important stations along the exposed frontier, and every possible preparation was made to defend them against a sudden attack. New batteries were hastily constructed at Toronto. Guns, arms, and stores were sent from Quebec to the magazines in the interior. At Montreal, when the telegraphic message announcing the rupture was read aloud at the Exchange, "cheer after cheer rang out to welcome it;" and in a week the volunteer force was doubled. The Catholic Bishop offered his palace for use as a barrack; and throughout the colony the Catholic clergy appear to have distinguished themselves by their zealous and effectual exhortations to their parishioners to volunteer for the common defence.

The attitude thus assumed by Canada is striking as an evidence of her own vigour, and her attachment to the mother country; and it acquires a special interest from the variety of the races which compose the Canadian population, and the peculiarities of their religious distribution. The census of the current year, which shows an increase of 36 per cent on that of 1852, estimates the entire population at 2,506,755. Of this number 1,917,777 are native Canadians;

1,037,170 of British, and 880,607 of French origin. In 1852, this native population was 73 per cent of the whole; it is now 76; and it is remarkable that the increase is confined to the French Canadian branch, which then numbered 35 per cent, and now numbers 38; while the British Canadians have remained at the proportion of 28 per cent. Besides the native population, the colony contains 241,423 Irishmen, 127,429 Englishmen and Welshmen, 111,952 Scotchmen, 64,399 natives of the United States, 23,855 Germans, 12,717 Indians, and 3,061 Frenchmen. The remainder are coloured people, chiefly resident in Upper Canada. The religious distribution of the community is as follows: Catholics, 1,200,870; members of the Church of England, 374,887; Methodists, 372,462; Presbyterians, the larger half of whom belong to the Free Church of Scotland, 346,991; Baptists, 69,310. The rest are of no particular religion. From these figures it appears, that of the members of the four Protestant denominations, the Church of England does not contain a third, while the Catholics, who in 1852 numbered 47 per cent only, now number upwards of 50 per cent on the whole religious census.

The satisfaction inspired by the progress of events in relation to Canada has been qualified by the existence of serious distress nearer home. In Ireland the failure of the last year's crops, following on the worse than doubtful harvest of 1860, has been felt severely by the small farmers and tradesmen, especially in the south and west; and though the cry of complaint may have been pitched in a higher key than the facts would altogether justify, it certainly approaches far nearer to the truth than the complacent optimism by which it has been met. The number of work-house inmates is never a fair test of Irish distress; and the institution of relief committees, for the first time since 1847, in districts which of late years have been flourishing and progressive, is a fact which cannot be swept away by the reckless and inaccurate assertions in which Sir Robert Peel is too much accustomed to indulge. There is no foundation for his reiterated statement that the Irish landlords have ignored the distress

which exists around them. Nor is it easy to harmonise his own contemptuous denial of any ground for apprehension with the defence of Government measures, which, however small in their proportions, essentially imply a condition of exceptional need. That their proportions are small is, however, by no means a fault; for the need has not yet risen to that point beyond which local resources would become inadequate to meet it; and until it does so, a grant of imperial money, whether for the purpose of direct relief or for employment in reproductive works, is very strongly to be deprecated. Such a grant, under present circumstances, would be unjust to the Empire at large; and it would create a distinction which Irishmen should be the last to desire between its recipients and the labouring classes in Lancashire and other northern counties of England, where the blockade of the American ports has thrown a very large number of workmen out of employment altogether, and reduced a still larger number to work only half-time.

So heavily, indeed, has this consequence of the blockade pressed on our manufacturing population, that it seemed likely at one time to afford occasion for a party struggle on the meeting of Parliament. The Government had lost several seats during the recess; and the opposition press took advantage of the strong feeling raised by the *Trent* outrage to urge the breaking of the blockade under any circumstances, and even to indicate the policy of a full recognition of the Southern Confederacy. But the new Tory members have, most of them, oddly enough, been returned on a definite pledge to support Lord Palmerston; and they know that it would be useless at present to ask their constituents for the ratification of any vote which would have the effect of driving him from power. The game of the Opposition, therefore, is to wait. Accordingly, when Parliament met, on the 6th of February, their leaders not only showed no desire to engage in a trial of strength, but explicitly adopted the ministerial policy of neutrality in the American Civil War, and endorsed with complete approval the steps

taken by the Government with regard to the affair of the *Trent*. On this latter point the favourable judgment of the House of Commons was afterwards expressed with striking unanimity on the motion for going into Committee of Supply on the 17th of February. The question coming under discussion was the Supplementary Army and Navy Estimates for the expenses of the North American reinforcements; and Mr. Bright took the opportunity of arraigning Ministers for having supported Lord Russell's despatch by preparations, "both as regarded the army and the navy, exactly as if the despatch itself had not been a courteous demand for compliance with a just request, but rather a declaration of war." To take such a course, he maintained, was to raise a needless and mischievous alarm in this country; to place a false issue before the American Government; and to put difficulties in the way of Mr. Lincoln's compliance with a demand which American principles and precedents would otherwise have led him to concede as a matter of course. Lord Palmerston gained an easy triumph in reply by an analysis of some of the familiar facts: showing the support Captain Wilkes had received from the people, the administration, and the legislature of his own country, and arguing that to have left Canada and the British North American Colonies undefended would have been to invite a continuance of that support, and consequently to necessitate a war.

Beyond the Supplementary Estimates, Parliament has not yet passed any thing of importance. On the 13th of February, a statement was made by Lord Granville in the House of Lords, and Mr. Lowe in the House of Commons, on the revised Educational Code, which we have discussed elsewhere; and on the 17th the Lord Chancellor introduced his Bill for simplifying the Transfer of Land, founded on the same principle as that brought in by Sir Hugh Cairns in 1859. Lord Cranworth and Lord Chelmsford have each brought in two Bills on the same subject; and all the five are to be read a second time on the 3d of March.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

France: The Society of St. Vincent of Paul.

France, a country of democracy, and yet without any poor-law, or legal provision against the effects of poverty, has developed, in the Society of St. Vincent of Paul, an institution in wonderful harmony with the laws of political economy. The object of all poor relief should be to cure, not to encourage poverty; and the remedy for poverty, as distinguished from the remedy for the accidental sufferings springing from bad harvests or commercial failures, does not lie in the material resources of the rich, but in the moral resources of the poor. These moral resources are only put to sleep, and at last killed, by gifts of money, which preserve the life of the poor man in his necessity, and therefore must always be an element in a poor-law, but which, by themselves, always tend to give longer life and more strength to pauperism. The strength of pauperism can only be undermined by personal and moral influences, sympathy and charity. The best poor-law organisation is, therefore, one like that of the Society of St. Vincent of Paul; for only such a plan can intercept poverty on its way to pauperism, and can permanently relieve, not only the poor, but the State. Poverty arises from two sources: the fault of the poor man, and external circumstances over which he has little control. It is only the latter kind of poverty that is really relieved by gifts; the former can only be mitigated and prevented by influences which do not belong to the State; and the social action of these influences tends to restrict pauperism to those who are poor by no fault of their own; and only these have a real claim on the State, and a distinct right to be directly supported by the public. Indiscriminate almsgiving is as contrary to the maxim of the Apostle as to political science; and only almsgiving indiscriminated by moral tests is possible in a poor-law which employs no moral influences, but only distributes material resources.

On the other hand, no State can admit an *imperium in imperio*, an independent corporation within the State, which has the same political objects as the State has. Where there is a sharp distinction between political and social objects, this principle produces no inconveniences; but where the State pretends to all the rights of providence over the social, the moral, and the religious well-being of its citizens, the principle amounts to a negation of all corporate rights whatever. Such is the result of the French system of government. A despotic State, founded on a proletariat, is naturally jealous of influences which come between it and the basis of its power; and the doctrine of such States is, that, since the government undertakes to do for the people every thing that subordinate corporations could undertake, such corporations are both superfluous and derogatory to the majesty of the supreme power. Thus, the Convention decreed, August 18, 1793, that "a State absolutely free ought not to suffer any corporation to exist within it, not even such as have, by devotion to public instruction, deserved well of their country." This was only a revival of a principle of Lewis XIV., who, although in his capacity of Providence he thought it his duty sometimes to approve solemnly of acts of charity done by others, and this in a way to adopt them as his own, yet, on other occasions, threatened to punish all acts of private beneficence, on the ground that the King, as the absolute State, and no one else, was the asylum and shelter of the poor in France.

Lewis Napoleon takes the line of Lewis XIV. He only suppresses works of charity when they are not done in his name. This is the meaning of Persigny's circular to the prefects, dated October 16, which points out the "necessity of legalising charitable societies." It is only, he says, the "inconvenience" of their independence, *i. e.* the fundamental contradiction between their independent existence and the claims of the absolute State, of which government has

to complain; while "they merit all the sympathy of the government for the good works they accomplish in the country." There are many such societies in France. Those of St. Vincent of Paul, St. Francis Regis, and St. Francis de Sales, are religious; that of the Freemasons secular, but "purely philanthropic." To the "order and spirit" of the Freemasons Persigny has no objection to make, only to its central organisation, and to "a mode of election calculated to promote a rivalry between various lodges," which must be always painful to the heart of a truly paternal government.

The religious associations, "founded to distribute assistance to the indigent, and to lecture and instruct the working classes," zealously pursue their virtuous object, powerfully contribute to the relief and reformation of the poor, and concur in maintaining the sentiment of charity among the rich; their spirit, too, is completely "disengaged from all political bearings;" nevertheless, this praise only attaches to the local conferences, not to the provincial, still less to the general councils. The provincial committees, under the appearance of encouraging the particular efforts of various conferences, usurp their direction, deprive them of the right of electing their own officers, and thus rule all the societies of a province, so as to make them the instruments of an idea foreign to that of charity. An absolute government cannot tolerate this infraction of personal liberty. The superior council in Paris is a directing committee, not appointed by the local societies, but self-elected; it arrogates the right of governing them, so as to make of them a kind of secret society, having branches beyond the bounds of France; and it levies contributions from them, the employment of which is not known. The interests of charity alone do not require this organisation; men at Lyons or Marseilles must know better than men at Paris the wants of the poor at Marseilles and Lyons "In fine, does Christian charity require for its exercise to be constituted under the form of secret societies?" Therefore Persigny tells the prefects to authorise all local conferences, but to suppress all provincial committees;

and if the local conferences should afterwards desire to have at Paris, near the seat of government, a central representation, the Emperor will determine on what basis and principles this central council may be organised. Till then the central council is suppressed.

In spite of the protests of all parties in France, this resolution has been carried out; and the conferences of St. Vincent of Paul can now only exist in as much subjection to the direction of the government as the newspaper press or the Exchange. The greater the folly and wickedness of this step, the more important is it as a *reductio ad absurdum* of the theory of government which finds favour over all Latin Europe.

The Budget.

In spite of the increasing wealth of France, the condition of the money-market had long shown that there was disorder in the finances; and those who suspected this disorder were confirmed in their suspicions by Persigny's severe treatment of those who wrote on finance in the press. No one was therefore amazed at the deficit announced by M. Fould in his report, dated last September, and published in the *Moniteur* in November last. A deficiency of 40,000,000*l.* on the budget of a single year could only be met by loans, and loans could only be contracted if credit was restored; and the most likely way of restoring credit was to make confession of the past, and to promise amendment for the future. But a dynasty which "personifies the instincts of national pride [the instinct of war], and of laborious emulation" [that of modified communism], could amend nothing but a few abuses and dilapidations, which make but a small part of the deficit; it could never really decrease its military expenses, or suddenly cease to provide work for the people, or to cheapen bread for them. The Orleans dynasty had accepted this supposed duty of providing work and food; but between 1833 and 1857 these extraordinary expenses were only 2142 millions of francs, or about twice as much as the present deficit; whereas the extraordinary resources—loans for the most part—in the five years

from 1853 to 1857 inclusive were 2167 millions, and in the same period the extraordinary works have cost 421 millions. The works, then, have figured for a small portion only of the grand total of extravagance, which was for the most part incurred in virtue of the Imperial decrees, without the previous concurrence of the Chambers. We see, then, what an enormous irresponsible power the Emperor has hitherto possessed in finance. The question is, does he by the present modifications lose any of this power? M. Troplong's report, read in the Senate Dec. 17, shows that no such loss was ever contemplated.

The present constitution of France M. Troplong describes as being "the alliance of the ideas of liberty of 1789 with the ideas of order of 1852. . . . It did not undertake to restore the liberty, the combination and forms, which were crushed in 1848 by the revolution, and which universal suffrage declared incompatible with the wants of a society guided by democracy, but fearing the abyss into which it might be hurried by the weakness of the pilot, or of the helm. The country under this constitution must obtain all the franchises which it can support without injury to itself; but the government must not lose any of the attributes which constitute its liberty (absolutism), and which necessarily belong to its authority." That is, it must not lose any of its present power in regulating by itself the expenditure of the country.

During the parliamentary government and the Republic, the French budget of expenses for the coming year was voted by chapters; that is, in divisions specifying the particular objects to which the money was to be applied, and the amount to be spent on each. But the constitution of 1852 altered this arrangement, and certain sums were from that time voted to the ministers of the respective departments, to be expended by them at their discretion, on the matters under their control, without any previous specification of the particular objects.

Since 1852 the voting has been, and will continue to be, a mere form; for no deputy can propose any amendment to the budget till the amend-

ment has been adopted by the Committee of the Budget, and by the Council of State.

As the budgets are voted eighteen months before they are spent, it is clear that no ordinary mortal, not even "the man who reads the future," as the Emperor is called by M. Troplong in proposing this present acknowledgment of his shortsightedness, can foresee and provide for all the accidents that may happen. Such accidents can only be met by expedients of the moment: there are two classes into which such expedients naturally fall; either some department of expenditure is starved, and its revenue transferred to that upon which the accident presses, or the ordinary expenditure remains as it was voted, and the pressure is met by additional and extraordinary credits. There is not much difference in principle in these two methods, for the starved department virtually runs into debt, while the extraordinary credit is only the same debt avowedly placed to the account of the department whose necessities really caused it. M. Troplong's report, however, makes great play with the suppression of the extraordinary credits, and the substitution of the system of transfers.

The real reform wanted was the transfer of the power of making these supplementary credits from the hands of the Emperor to those of the representative bodies, or of ministers responsible to them; but this is by no means to happen. It is the Emperor, in his Council of State, who will still regulate all the transfers.

Thus, as M. Troplong says, politically "the measure is only a change in the form of proceeding;" there is no substantial alteration—"it is not the disavowal of a glorious past," nor is it "a consequence of accumulated embarrassments," but a free act of a government that is master of the situation. The Emperor does not repent of the expenses he has forced on France, for "France is a democracy. . . . But democracy does not become softened and disciplined under the hand of the government which it accepts, unless that government embraces in a vast view its numerous, varied, and active interests. Hence come the vast enterprises, great works, economic reforms, military glory, ge-

neral activity, and progressive welfare," on which the imperial government has spent so many millions during the last ten years.

If there is to be no change in substance, what is the import of the present alteration? M. Troplong confesses it is because the imperial government cannot raise money; it has lost its credit. "Credit, or the employment of other person's power, is of such delicacy that it cannot be treated without due preparation. It is disquieted by surprises; it has confidence only in what is defined." Therefore let the Chamber define the objects of the budget; but let not this definition be so rigid as to be unchangeable; let the Emperor have the prerogative of changing the credits from one section to another, whenever urgent and unforeseen circumstances require it. This, says M. Troplong, is all that M. Fould meant when he said, "The real danger for our finances is in the liberty which the government possesses of decreeing expenses without the control of the legislative power."

If it was all M. Fould meant, M. Fould's report was a very insignificant document; but he probably meant more, which "unforeseen occurrences" made undesirable to carry out at the time. He did not foresee the prospect of war between England and the United States, and the opportunity thereby offered to France for settling the Italian and the Rhenish questions to its own liking. If the political situation of the end of the year could have been foreseen, there would have been no confession of a deficiency of 40,000,000*l.* in the budget, nor any promise of a constitutional change. The confession cannot be recalled, though M. Troplong strives to make it rather a triumph than a penance; the promise, even if it was ever sincere, can easily be evaded, as it is in M. Troplong's report. France, therefore, does not make the least advance in liberty or self-government by this boasted concession. The Emperor, who is no man of business, and does not understand details, was very likely convinced by M. Fould, and has since had his convictions disturbed by persons who saw better than he the real meaning of M. Fould's propositions.

In M. Fould's report, printed in January, he announces his principle by the epigrammatic law, that "in the ordinary budget revenue is based on estimates; in the extraordinary budget estimates are based on the revenue." And he proposes two means for bringing down the extraordinary expenses, and two for raising the ordinary revenue. For the first, he would put an end to the Roman occupation, and reduce the army by 70,000 men. For the second, he would increase the taxation by about 5,000,000*l.* yearly, and decrease the ordinary expenditure by a transformation of the 43 per-cent debt into 3 per cent; the latter being proportionately at a higher value in the market than the former.

In his speech on opening the Chambers, January 27, the Emperor noticed the preservation of peace during 1861; the visit of the King of Prussia, and the recognition of the Kingdom of Italy; the civil war in America, which though injurious to French commerce, was not to be interfered with so long as the rights of neutrals are respected; the French establishment in Cochin China, and the joint expedition with England and Spain to Mexico. Then he adverted to the deficit, the greatness of which he acknowledged, and at the same time claimed a set-off on account of the immense internal improvements that had been effected in the country during its accumulation, and the military glory that it had helped to purchase. He referred to the distresses which seemed imminent over the labouring population of France, and hoped that they would not hold him responsible for their sufferings; an event that is of common occurrence in despotic monarchies, where the government assumes the functions of providence, and pretends to regulate beforehand all the details of life. He made no mention either of the reduction of the army, or of the Roman occupation.

But the French ambassador at Rome had interchanged communications with Cardinal Antonelli, the dates of which sufficiently prove that they were intended rather for the French Chambers than for the Roman Court. January 11, M. Thouvenel wrote to the ambassador, the Marquis de Lavalette, instructing him that,

though France had sympathies with both sides in the Italian dispute, she could not be responsible for maintaining a state of things that was equally injurious to both sides. He then proceeds: "The question of the day is to learn whether the Pontifical Government intends always to apply to the regulation of its relations with the new *régime* established in the peninsula that inflexibility which is the first of its duties, as it is the most incontestable of its rights, in spiritual affairs; or whether, whatever may be its judgment on the transformation effected in Italy, it will resolve to accept the necessities which follow from this great fact."

It is impossible, he says, to restore the past. Neither Austria, Spain, nor Bavaria, which alone have refused to acknowledge the new state of Italy, thinks of interfering to restore the old.

"Openly proclaimed or tacitly admitted, the principle of non-intervention has become the safeguard of European peace, and the Court of Rome certainly does not expect from foreign aid the means of reconquering the provinces she has lost. I go further: I refuse to believe that the Court of Rome will consent to provoke, in an interest where success would be at least doubtful, conflagrations the most formidable yet recorded in history. Do not the lessons of experience, combined with considerations most fitting to touch the Holy See, command it to resign itself, without renouncing its rights, to a practical arrangement which would restore calm to the bosom of the Catholic world, renew the traditions of the Papacy which has so long covered Italy under its ægis, and bind itself afresh to the new destinies of a nation, cruelly tried, and restored, after so many centuries, to herself?"

"I do not pretend to discuss here any mode of solution. It is sufficient for me to say that the Government of the Emperor has preserved, in this respect, complete liberty of judgment and action; and all that we have to discover now is, whether we ought to cherish or abandon the hope of seeing the Holy See lend itself, keeping account of accomplished facts, to the study of a combination which would assure to the Sovereign Pontiff

the permanent conditions of dignity, security, and independence, necessary to the exercise of his power."

In conclusion, M. Thouvenel points out the great advantage, both to Italy and France, which would arise from the reconciliation of the Pope and the Italian Government.

M. de Lavalette, in a despatch dated January 18th, describes the reception of this communication by the Pontifical Government.

"Without leaving to his Holiness any illusions respecting a restoration of the past, without forgetting the exigencies of a present so intimately connected with our interests, I did not neglect any opportunity of preparing the Holy Father, in general terms, for an arrangement which would answer our most sincere wishes, a reconciliation between Rome and Italy. I found also, in the courteous reception accorded to me, the right to appeal to the confidence of his Holiness, and to seek from him the expression of a hope or a wish, to the realisation of which the government of the Emperor would be happy to be able to contribute."

In his previous interviews with the Pope, the Holy Father had always concluded with the words, "Let us await events;" and Cardinal Antonelli had met every previous offer of compromise with the most unqualified refusal.

"All negotiation," said the Cardinal, on this occasion, "is impossible between the Holy See and those who have despoiled it. It does not depend on the Sovereign Pontiff, it is not in the power of the Sacred College, to cede the smallest portion of ecclesiastical territory."

Lavalette hereupon told the Cardinal that he could not enter into the question of rights or of abstract principles. His only object was a practical one—to offer to the Pontifical Government an opportunity of escaping, while reserving its rights, from a situation as disastrous for its interests as it was menacing to the peace of the Christian world.

This was the Emperor's object, and this was the tenor of the ambassador's instructions. He then read to the Cardinal M. Thouvenel's despatch. We will give Cardinal Antonelli's reply, a reply afterwards endorsed by

the Pope, in M. de Lavalette's words. "I find in this despatch," replied his Eminence, "the expression of that affectionate interest which you have never ceased to show for us. It is not exactly true, however, that there is disagreement between the Sovereign Pontiff and Italy. Although there may be a rupture between the Holy Father and the Cabinet of Turin, he has none but excellent relations with Italy. An Italian himself, and the first of Italians, he suffers with her sufferings, and witnesses with grief the cruel trials which have troubled the Italian Church. As for making a pact with the despoilers, we will never do it. I can only repeat that all negotiation on this footing is impossible. Whatever might be the reservations with which it was accompanied, with whatever graces of language it might be surrounded, from the moment of accepting it we should appear to consecrate it. The Sovereign Pontiff, before his elevation, as well as the Cardinals since their nomination, have engaged themselves by oath to cede no part of the territories of the Church. The Holy Father, therefore, will make no concession of this nature; a conclave would not have the right to make it; a new Pontiff would be unable to make it; his successors from age to age would be no more free to make it than himself."

"The calm tone of the Cardinal Secretary of State announced a resolution all the more immovable that it showed his thoughts to be running in a channel which escaped from the discussion. I confined myself to observing to Cardinal Antonelli that the character of his declaration imposed on me the duty of asking him if I could regard it, and transmit it to the Emperor, as the final response of the Holy See. After a moment of reflection, his Eminence offered to refer it to the Holy Father, although it was his conviction that this step was unnecessary. It was a profound sense of duty and obligation that had dictated to his Holiness the solemn declaration which, in his encyclicals and allocutions, he had so frequently made to the entire Catholic world. The Cardinal, therefore, had no difficulty in foreseeing a reply, which, at the same time, he promised to transmit

to me on the morrow, either in writing or by the intermediation of one of his prelates.

"I have this morning received from the Cardinal Secretary of State the note, a translation of which your Excellency will find enclosed. After having received the orders of the Holy Father, his Eminence had nothing to add, nothing to retract, from his declaration of the preceding evening."

"In conclusion, M. le Ministre, your Excellency will consider this question, the exact terms of which I reproduce:—Ought we to nourish the hope that the Holy See, taking accomplished facts into consideration, will devote itself to the study of a combination which would assure to the Sovereign Pontiff the permanent conditions of dignity, security, and independence necessary to the exercise of his power?"

"It is with profound regret that I find myself obliged to reply in the negative; but I should think myself wanting in my duty if I left you in possession of a hope which I do not entertain myself."

There is to be very little discussion in the French Chambers on this subject. The draft address of the Senate, in reply to the Emperor's speech, contains the following reference to it:

After declaring that the Emperor has uprightly carried out his Italian programme, and urging him to persevere in the same path of protection and conciliation, the Senate sympathises with him in his regret at finding on one side "immoderate pretensions," and on the other "resistance and immobility." It declares that

* The *Moniteur* of Feb. 20, published the following in its bulletin: "The Government of the Emperor has thought it right to ask explanations from Rome respecting the letter of the Cardinal Prefect of the Council, inviting all the Bishops of Christendom to attend the ceremony of certain martyrs. These explanations have become necessary, because the letter of convocation has been published in France without having been first communicated to the Government. Cardinal Antonelli has replied that the letter addressed to the Bishops was simply a friendly letter of invitation, without any obligatory character, and for a solemnity simply religious. Under these circumstances, the Government has come to the conclusion that the Bishops should not leave their dioceses, or ask permission to leave the empire, unless serious interests connected with their dioceses should call them to Rome."

"calm and moderation" are requisite for achieving a great work, and that without them "the justest causes are led astray by extreme refusals, and are incompatible with the good conduct of human affairs."

The address, which gives no ground for expecting any immediate change in the relations between France, Italy, and the Holy See, is occupied chiefly with the internal affairs of France; the distress arising from the commercial stagnation caused by the American civil war, and increased by the insufficient harvest of last year. It still recommends non-intervention and neutrality in relation to America, because the only way to shorten the struggle is to abstain from interfering in it; and has nothing to propose for the relief of the distress, which has not yet come to its worst, but a development of those public works which have for so many years past afforded food to the dangerous portion of the population. In the absence of a poor-law, and with the Society of St. Vincent of Paul dissolved, it is hard to see what other resource was open to the government.

Besides recommending the government to undertake this organisation of labour, the senators lament that its funds will not be sufficient to undertake a like control of literature and education, as if in these points the second Empire intended to imitate the first. The ecclesiastical policy of the government is also significantly indicated by the recommendation of an increase of salary to the secular clergy, whose poverty is contrasted with the ampler means of the regulars—"abundant private liberality seeks out religious congregations." The address concludes by contrasting the Emperor's policy of "legitimate interests" with the "policy of passion," which characterises the other parties in France; a comparison which exactly tallies with the ancient distinction of expediency and principle which has divided mankind from very early times.

It would be absurd to suppose that Bonapartism in France is not as much a passion as Legitimism. The empire rests partly on the adhesion of the Bonapartists, partly on the division and on the fears of the other parties. But the contrast drawn by

the Senate may be illustrated in the conduct of the liberal Catholic party in France during the uncertainty of the *Trent* affair. This party can amuse itself with "the charming simplicity of the English character, that measures the morality of foreign governments by their convenience to England alone;" but during the uncertainty of the *Trent* affair it seemed to measure the morality of our dealings with America solely by the effect they had on the French government. The government taking our part was sufficient reason for the opposition to take part against us, to justify Capt. Wilkes, to endorse Mr. Sumner's precedents, to declare that England had been waiting for years for the opportunity to crush its old rival, enemy, and rebel, the great historical creation of France, her faithful ally and customer, the United States. "C'est la passion de prendre une éclatante revanche de la révolution des Etats-Unis," said the *Correspondant* of December, "c'est l'envie de profiter de la situation périlleuse de ce peuple, autrefois le sujet, aujourd'hui le rival d'Angleterre, pour le couper en morceaux, pour détruire sa puissance nationale, commerciale, maritime. Ce peuple est notre œuvre, notre allié, notre client; il est, au contraire, le rebelle, l'ennemi, le rival d'Angleterre;" and adds, in condemnation of the Emperor's policy: "If France, for her own purposes, is glad to see England occupied with the New World, and somewhat inattentive to the old,—if she cries out with Manchester, Let America perish rather than the cotton-trade,—she will countenance and help England, blame the United States, and let the storm grow more furious against the work of Washington; a part not very agreeable to England, who is strong enough to settle her quarrels without help, and disgraceful to us, as it sets three upon one, and gains a victory too easy to be glorious." No stronger example could be given of the policy of passion and feeling, as contrasted with the policy of "legitimate interests;" and there is no party among those which divide the allegiance of European politicians less devoted to principle than that whose organ we have quoted. A legitimate interest may be made by a party the standard

of its political views, and it will then form a system in harmony with its interests, but in which certain definite political principles may be appealed to. The interests of a certain class of English industry have given rise to a consistent political system in the Manchester school. Writers like Lamennais and Ventura were guided by what they held to be the interests of the Church to distinct political doctrines, in whose efficacy and truth they too sincerely believed to sacrifice or renounce them in obedience to the apparent interests of the moment. But by the liberal Catholics of France no principle is ever enunciated that will not under certain circumstances be abandoned; no political truth is sacred enough in their eyes not to be overruled by considerations of religious interests, or by the sympathies or the prejudices of the hour. Friends of the Italian war, they condemned the Italian revolution; lovers of the independence of Italy, they oppose her unity. They applaud the expulsion of the Austrians because the Austrians are foreigners; and they would tolerate no resistance to the Pope, however oppressive or absolute his government might be. There is something in the fanaticism and rimbaldry of Veuillot that is manly and consistent, in comparison with writers such as these, whose principles are adopted or abandoned at the dictation of an interest, whose language varies with the hour and the latitude, who defend a cause in which they do not believe, and resist the truths which they know.

The conformity of the French government to the character of the nation is exhibited very distinctly and very involuntarily in the character of some of those parties which most actively oppose it. The distinction between the acts of the Emperor and the spirit of the people—the leading fallacy of the enemies of Napoleon III.—is religiously maintained by the Catholic liberals. The glory of their country helped to reconcile them to the Italian war, but its inevitable consequences are made a reproach to the Emperor. Their traditional hatred of Austria is nourished as much by Austrian liberty as by Austrian despotism. Their attack on the policy of their government in the American

quarrel is compensated for by adulation of the people, and of its great deeds of old. Even in the reverence for the old French constitution, that which preponderates is a love for its forms. Their opposition is confined to the ruling system, and does not extend, like that of Tocqueville, to the whole condition of society and of political thought in the country, by which that system is sustained. No great improvement can therefore be anticipated in the government of France from the victory of the educated malcontents. The constitutional government they would introduce would be as absolute as that which is now so bitterly assailed. It would possess neither greater securities of stability nor greater safeguards against abuse; it would be neither limited nor fenced by the orders of the State, and its authority would be continuous with its might. No other description of authority can keep order in a State threatened with a social revolution. And this is the meaning of the distinction which is justly drawn between interests and passions, which with unprincipled men is the term for principles, just as fanaticism is the name given by the irreligious to piety, and superstition to faith. A government founded on interests, not on rights, neither appeals to its own right nor recognises that of others. Expediency is the supreme law in its reciprocal relations with the people. It relies for popularity on the claims it successively acquires, not for reverence on the right it originally possessed. All those things which invalidate authority—usurpation, despotism, revolution, aggression, and the refusal to admit the control either of law or of force—taint, but do not weaken it. Possessing no moral power, no protection in the sense of duty, no right to the obedience of the people, it provides a substitute for all that it wants in the increase of physical power, and in measures which gain over the popular interests. It has not the means of passing from absolutism to a regulated power, for it cannot acquire those securities on which all lawful government rests. Diminution of force is a loss of security, and the concession of safeguards is the surrender of an outwork. But it finds a

resource in the passions as well as in the interests of the people, and satisfies the first by its policy abroad, the other by its policy at home. In both respects it contrasts strongly with legitimate governments, which are obeyed for the sake of the past as much as for the sake of the future, and which continue in spite of unpopularity and weakness, claiming respect for what they are, and not for what they do.

Population.

It was formerly believed that the strength and prosperity of a State depended on its actual numbers. Every encouragement was given to the increase of the population by early marriages, and by the abolition of certain moral impediments. The removal of the restrictions on trade was one of the fruits of this belief. Malthus's book appeared and caused a revolution; for half a century afterwards the tendency was to dread the excess of population, to encourage emigration, and to attribute the pressure of poverty to an excess of numbers.

Thinness of population, carried to a certain point, promotes slavery, as the only way to secure labour. Carried farther still, it leads to barbarism, and to the dominion of nature over man. For nature is only overcome by combination of labour. This is one reason why the dwellers on the frontiers of civilisation sink to a lower level of civilisation, like the trappers and pioneers in America. The degree of coincidence between a high population and social prosperity depends on the proportion of numbers to the means of subsistence. If food cannot be produced, or provided by commerce at the price the people can pay, the population is in excess.

A population relatively less compact may be better off than that of a more thickly populated State, if it commands a proportionably greater amount of natural resources. For then an equal amount of labour will produce greater results. The advantage depends also on the distribu-

tion of the inhabitants. If that is very unequal, it is an evil. The packing of our population in our manufacturing towns tends to give them a morbid influence on the whole country, as their condition makes our policy dependent on material considerations, and destroys its imperial character, by causing a particular social influence to predominate over reasons of State. But then our manufacturing districts do not suck in the people from rural districts, and depopulate other countries to the same extent as the French towns depopulate the agricultural departments. In France, certain departments increase enormously at the expense of many more. This is by no means a healthy increase.

The substance of the Malthusian law is, that population must not be directly encouraged, because its benefit depends on the presence of certain conditions, the first of which is the supply of food. Increase of means of subsistence produces naturally an increase of population. Increase of population without the corresponding increase of means is ruinous to the State.

Quick and regular increase of population is therefore a necessary sign of prosperity. Where it fails, something essential is wanting in the moral or the physical order.

In England, although the growth of the people is a source of distress, it is a sign of prosperity. It is better that the excess should be drained away by emigration, and the distress relieved by poor's-rate, than that the elasticity of the race should be at an end. The rapid increase proves the growth of cultivation, the refinement of labour, and the intensity of production. Our wealth and our productive power have grown more rapidly than our population, and our poor's-rates have diminished.

In France the census of the population is taken every five years.

The following table shows the growth of the nation from the beginning of the century to 1861, the census of which year has just been published:

1801	27,349,003				
1806	29,107,425	:	total increase,	1,758,422	; annual increase, 351,685
1821	30,461,875	„	„	1,354,450	„ „ 90,292

1826	31,858,937:	total increase, 1,397,062;	annual increase, 279,415
1831	32,569,223	" "	858,937 " "
1836	33,540,910	" "	971,687 " "
1841	34,217,719	" "	676,809 " "
1846	35,400,486	" "	1,182,767 " "
1851	35,783,170	" "	382,684 " "
1856	36,039,364	" "	256,194 " "
1861	36,713,166	" "	" "
Savoy and Nice	669,059	} " "	673,802 " "
	37,382,225		
			134,760

Thus the population has regained some of the elasticity which it seemed to have lost in the frightful return of 1856, though the improvement is due solely to an improved sanitary condition, and to a diminished average of deaths, and not to greater productivity. In the first half of the eighteenth century, the increase of population was only 33,000 a year, or about 1 for every 600 inhabitants. From 1821 to 1826 it was nearly 280,000 a year, or about 1 in 114 inhabitants. But it is remarkable that the births in the last century were not so very different in number from those in the present. In 1782 there were 975,703 births in a population of about 24,000,000, somewhat less than 1 in 26; and in 1822 there were only 972,632 births in a population of about 30,500,000, somewhat more than 1 in 31; so that the absolute fertility of the race had diminished enormously in 1822. Thirty years later, in 1852, the births were only 964,959 in a population of about 35,900,000, not quite 1 in 37, showing a progressive diminution in the vitality of the race, which contrasts curiously with the vigorous vitality of the French Canadians, who, in spite of not being recruited by emigration, not only keep up, but manage slightly to improve, their relative proportion to the rest of the inhabitants of the colony.

Thus the greater increase of the population of France in this century has not been due to any increased productive vigour, but to sanitary causes which have prolonged the average of life. In 1782 the deaths were 948,502, only 27,201 below the number of births; in 1822 the deaths were 777,037, or 195,595 below the births; and in 1852 they were 810,737, or 154,222 below the births. The excess of births over deaths was greatest in the period between 1811 and

1820, and seems to have been gradually diminishing ever since, in consequence of the lessening of the proportionate birth-rate to the number of the population.

And the population, thus stationary in numbers, ever tends to a fresh local distribution. The towns are continually sucking the people from the country; and the artisans are multiplying at the expense of the peasantry. The census of 1856 showed that this alteration had been progressing with extraordinary rapidity during the five preceding years. There had been an actual decrease in the population of 54 departments, and an increase only in 32. The census of 1861 shows that in the next five years 57 departments progressed, while only 29 went backwards. Still the tendency is towards accumulating masses of people in the towns, and thinning the population of the agricultural districts. In the department of the Seine the increase is 13 per cent; in those of the north and the mouth of the Rhone it is 7 per cent in the four years. This shows how the people must have immigrated from the country into Paris and other great towns, and explains how the policy of the Empire has come to be dependent upon the caprices and the necessities of the town populations, though the Empire itself was founded on the votes of the rural inhabitants.

In order to see how this packing of the population affects its power and vitality, we must not only look at the absolute average of births, but we must also separate the legitimate from the illegitimate; for the increase of births out of marriage is no element of national strength; the number of such children reared to maturity is proportionately small. Of those who live, through defect of education, neglect, and the want of position, a great

proportionate number becomes sunk in the dangerous and criminal part of the people. And the rest, being without property or kin, add to the mass of pauperism. And we must compare the relative fecundity of marriages with respect to the distribution of the population.

According to the rate of annual increase in France, from 1851 to 1856, the population would double in 405 years; that of England actually doubled in the first half of the present century, besides sending out some 4,000,000 emigrants. In several European countries, such as Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, the average mortality is higher than in France; but nowhere is the average rate of births so low. The birth-rate, not the absolute increase of population, is the test of vitality and productivity; for a high average of births may be counteracted by a still higher rate of mortality, which may prove nothing against the national vitality. It is only when the natural increase of the population, which ought in the most favourable circumstances to be 3 per cent annually, is prevented by the low rate of births, that we are able to conclude that deep moral causes are at work, and that the population is becoming worn out. Thus the evil condition of France is not expressed by the figures of actual increase or decrease; but it must be sought for in a deeper analysis of the figures which make up the census.

From 1830 the population went on increasing, though at a slower and slower rate; but the number of births diminished both absolutely and relatively.

With regard to relative decrease, in 1801 there were 3·33 births to 100 inhabitants; 1821, 3·07; 1831, 3·03; 1841, 2·82; 1851, 2·70; 1856, 2·61. The average of births annually, compared to the population in France, from 1844 to 1853, was 1 to 35·82, or of children born alive (the only ones worth reckoning as far as the State interests go) only 1 to 37·16. In no other state was the proportion worse than 1 to 34·35 (Belgium), generally much higher. In England, 1 to 30·06. In other states, 1 to 26 or 28.

The *absolute* diminution of births in France is shown by the following figures:

	Population.	Births.
1851	35,783,170	1,008,824
1853	35,885,648	975,537

The increase of the population of the great towns, at the expense of the country, diminishes the fruitfulness of the people, and increases their immorality.

In Paris the annual births are 1 to 32 of the inhabitants; in the other towns 1 to 35; in the country 1 to 41: so that the actual births are more numerous in great towns. But each marriage in Paris has on an average only 2·31 children; in the provinces 3·28: so that the legitimate fruitfulness is weakened. Whereas illegitimate children in Paris are 27·19 per cent of births; in the country 7·7. And it is to be remarked that the fecundity of marriages has gone on regularly decreasing in France ever since the beginning of the century. In fifty years it has diminished 25 per cent.

Since the population has increased, though the number of births has fallen off, the mortality must have diminished, and consequently the average length of life must have increased. But this social improvement need not imply health or vigour, for it is without productivity. For military purposes, that is, for the State, the greater length of life is nothing in comparison with the greater abundance of births. It must also be remembered that a lower birth-rate diminishes at a still greater rate the proportion of deaths, as deaths are more numerous among new-born children than among adults. Malthus (*Principles of Population*, ii. cap. 4 and 5) shows that marriages and births follow more rapidly where deaths are more frequent; *i. e.* that a greater mortality involves a greater productivity; whereas a long-lived population has the fewest births to show.

Vitality is shown more in fecundity than in diminished mortality. On the other hand, fecundity itself is no good unless children are reared. All who cannot be reared, but die before they can restore to society the expenses of their childhood, had, for the State's interest, better not have been born.

Now, on looking at the population tables, we find that France is above

all other European countries in the proportionate number of its adult population of thirty years old and upwards, and below them all in its proportion of children. England stands at the head of all countries for its large proportion of children under fifteen years of age—36,047 in every 100,000 inhabitants. Then come Prussia, Piedmont, Denmark, Saxony, Styria, and Belgium. France is last of all. England also stands at the head of all for its proportion of individuals from fifteen to twenty years of age, and here also the minimum is in France; so for individuals between twenty and thirty, the maximum is in England, the minimum in France. After the age of thirty years the tables are turned: France has the maximum of persons between thirty and forty (14,700 in 100,000), England the minimum (12,182); and the same results appear for all succeeding ages. Of old and middle-aged men France has the maximum among all the states of Europe, and England the minimum.

How shall we account for this? Partly, no doubt, that persons of less than thirty years die off faster in France than in any other country, and that persons past thirty have greater chance of living to old age in France than elsewhere. Still this account is insufficient. It is clear that the result is partly caused by the continually diminishing birth-rate. Among an equal number of inhabitants fewer children are born in France than elsewhere, and in proportion to the number born fewer survive to the age of thirty years than in any other country. Its numbers are kept up by the longevity of its adult population, not by a profuse reproduction. In England, on the contrary, our numbers are made up by the swarms of

children. Ours is a young country, France is an old country; we are an increasing, overflowing people; the French are nearly stationary. We can afford to live in hope, and wait for the future; their interest is to expend themselves on the present.

It is remarkable that the number of illegitimate births should be so low in France—about 7½ per cent of the whole number of births. It shows that similar causes depress the numbers both of legitimate and illegitimate births. This shows that the number of illegitimate children in proportion to the rest, or in proportion to the whole population, is no perfect test of the morality of that population. Various considerations must come in before it can be used for this purpose. Probably the best way would be to compare the numbers of such births with the number of unmarried women between the ages of fifteen and thirty-five.

The Minister of the Interior declares himself satisfied with the result of the census. It shows, he says, that "under the influence of general prosperity and well-being, the population inclines towards a normal progress." But it shows also that a population where only 319 children are produced annually under the Second Empire from the same number of married couples as produced 430 children annually in the beginning of the century, cannot again expend its blood at the same rate as it did during the wars of the First Empire. In 1854 and 1855, the cholera, a short harvest, and the Crimean war, caused an actual reduction of 69,318 and 37,274 for the two years. In the most disastrous years of the First Empire the annual increase was never less than 114,000.

THE RAMBLER.

VOL. VI. *New Series.*

MAY 1862.

PART XIX.

ENLARGEMENT OF THE "RAMBLER."

THE *Rambler* was commenced on the 1st of January 1848, as a weekly Magazine of "home and foreign literature, politics, science, and art." Its aim was to unite an intelligent and hearty acceptance of the Catholic dogma with free inquiry and discussion on questions which the Church has left open to debate ; and while avoiding, as far as possible, the domain of technical theology, to provide a medium for the expression of independent opinion on subjects of the day, whether interesting to the general public, or specially affecting Catholics. In this attempt we were supported beyond our hopes. It soon became evident that our design responded to a very serious need in the Catholic body ; and, in order to meet the wishes of our friends, and to present with less interruption the important papers with which we were supplied, we found it necessary, before a year was over, to increase the size of the Magazine, and to issue it in a monthly form.

It continued to be published as a monthly serial from the 1st of September 1848 to the 1st of February 1859. During this period of ten years and a half, we at first endeavoured to restrict it to topics of social and literary interest, without entering directly into the graver problems of moral or political philosophy. But the events of the time, and

VOL. VI. NEW SERIES.

G G

the circumstances of English Catholicism, gradually modified our position in this respect, compelling us more and more to open our pages to investigations of a deeper and more complex nature; and as the *Rambler* thus, by degrees, assumed a less ephemeral character than ordinarily belongs to a monthly periodical, there ceased to be any doubt that its objects would be best attained by still further increasing the amount of matter in each number, and diminishing, in a like degree, the frequency of publication. We were anxious to effect this change in such a manner as to raise no obstacle to our continued coöperation with any Catholic periodical of higher pretensions than our own; and instead, therefore, of adopting the form of a Quarterly Review, we determined to issue our Magazine at intervals of two months, while we doubled its size accordingly. We began the two-monthly series on the 1st of May 1859, and to-day we bring it to a close.

For the time appears to have now arrived when, without antagonism to any existing interest, we may allow the *Rambler* to proceed in its natural development; and we intend, therefore, to publish it henceforward as a Quarterly Review, the first Number of which will appear on the 1st of next July. Each quarterly number will be twice the size of the present two-monthly one; and an addition of one-third will thus be made to the total amount of matter published in the year. The contents of each number will be disposed under four heads, viz.—1. Editorial Articles. 2. Communicated Articles. 3. Contemporary Literature. 4. Current Events. All papers coming under the first, third, or fourth head will have our full sanction; but with regard to the representations and opinions advanced in the Communicated Articles, we are not to be understood as engaging our own responsibility further than the fact of our being parties to the publication involves.

We trust that the history of the *Rambler* affords a sufficient guarantee for its continued maintenance of those principles to which it owes its distinctive character, its past difficulties, and the success it has finally attained. In its

new form, it will abstain from direct theological discussion, as far as external circumstances will allow : and in dealing with those mixed questions into which theology indirectly enters, its aim will still be to combine devotion to the Church with discrimination and candour in the treatment of her opponents ; to reconcile freedom of inquiry with implicit faith ; and to discountenance what is untenable and unreal, without forgetting the tenderness due to the weak, or the reverence rightly claimed for what is sacred. Submitting without reserve to infallible authority, it will encourage a habit of manly investigation on subjects of scientific interest. It will assert the just claims of social progress ; and, in opposition to the revolutionary theory, it will every where uphold the validity of political right, and the harmonious development of the nation and the State on the basis of their historical traditions. It will investigate the past in order to discover and establish facts, not to secure the triumph of any given opinion. On the events and literature of the day it will endeavour to exercise a thoughtful criticism, free alike from prejudice and partiality. And by maintaining the supremacy of principle over interest, in every department of human thought and action, it will seek, as it has done hitherto, not only to enlarge and refine the intellect, but to strengthen and elevate the moral sense, in the educated classes of society.

THE INDIVIDUAL, THE CORPORATION, AND THE STATE.

CIVIL society is made up of three factors or elements, the various conditions and combinations of which determine its political character. These are, the individual, the corporation, and the state.

We can imagine men aggregated, not in civil society, but in herds, in an unorganised atomic condition, bound by no common laws, each doing what he pleases, each claiming absolute freedom and independence, recognising no authority over him in any one or in any number of his fellow-men, and only restrained by fear of superior power, and of pains which that power would inflict upon him for acts displeasing to it. This is the state of absolute personal liberty, or of anarchy limited solely by terror; an ideal state only to be found as a transitory phase of some radical revolution in a community, or perhaps in some hordes of savages whose reason is degraded beneath the higher levels of instinct among gregarious animals.

Again, we can imagine men organised into families or clans, where the individual person counts for nothing, but only the household which he represents as patriarch. This is the earliest political condition which legal antiquarians have discovered. Society was at first, not a collection of individuals, but an aggregation of families. As the individual is the unit of modern society, the family was the unit of patriarchal society. The political system was one of small independent corporations, and its common law was scanty, because the despotic commands of the heads of households were in the place of laws. These households were as isolated from each other as separate nations are now, and their communication was as indirect and ceremonious as international communication in the present system of Europe. The family group may be supposed to have enlarged by a series of concentric growths into the house, the phratria, the tribe, the clan, till at last it merged into a commonwealth, by the association of these distinct groups into a unity. But a commonwealth thus formed would always be based on the patriarchal principle of a real or fictitious community of descent among all the members of it. And in fact the history of political ideas begins with the assumption that kinship, real or adoptive, is the sole possible ground of community in political functions. The fiction of adoption, by which aliens in blood were acknow-

ledged to be descendants of a common ancestor, is connected with the primitive ideas of paternity. An inventor was the mythical ancestor of all who used his invention ; musicians and metal-workers were reckoned to be descended respectively from the first musician and the first worker in metals. This was not altogether a fiction. In the patriarchal society, when families were isolated, the tradition of inventions and the secrets of art must have remained long in single families. For the family is the original educator, the school is only its substitute for the function of education ; and knowledge was a precious possession, inherited like other valuables. Moreover, the imperfection of arts and sciences, the labour of learning what there was no one to teach, the limited experience of mankind, the monotonous life, inveterate custom, the sanction of religion, reverence, and superstition,—all aided the family law, and helped to keep each man in his own class or caste. The son of the Egyptian carpenter followed his father's trade, not because he inherited any instinctive aptitude for it, but because the family law forbade the father to teach a stranger the secrets of his craft ; while, on the other hand, the art laboriously acquired, through generations of patient workers, could not grow up suddenly elsewhere, or be invented afresh in another family without traditions and without tools, and it could not be directly learned without adoption into the family. Thus necessity, custom, law, interest, and religion, all contributed to make crafts hereditary, to found monopolies of knowledge, and to make single families the depositaries of secrets and mysteries. Thus Tubal became physically, adoptively, and traditionally—that is, as the originator of the tradition—the father of blacksmiths, and Jubal of harpists. Mankind became separated into defined classes and castes ; and it was the class, not the person, that was looked upon as the element of society, the undying unit for whose security customs grew up and laws were sanctioned. Thus musicians, builders, carpenters, and the like, must every where have formed castes, where the blood must have determined the trade before the trade came to be reckoned determinative of the blood. And, in fact, we find that in the dawn of history the constituent element or factor of society is the family or tribe. But from the very first we find the clan or house determined rather by community of religious rites, and of traditions (or of trades in the sense in which our old writers use the word), than by real community of blood. Hence the corporation has become the embodiment of custom and tradition. The family is its type. It is founded

on paternity,—on paternity, not only of blood, but of mind ; on paternity of religion, tradition, trade, knowledge, art, usage ; and the commonwealth founded on the corporation is that wherein hereditary customs of classes, the privileges of the hierarchy of ranks, and the multiplied centres of various traditional usages, have always dominated over the abstract rights of individuals voluntarily associated, or associated solely according to local contiguity, community of language, or sameness of nationality.

The state is the third political element. Growing up from the amalgamation of corporations, it assumes two distinct characters according to the way in which it treats the corporations of which it is composed. If it assumes to itself all corporate functions, it sets itself gradually to obliterate all corporate distinctions, and to reduce all its subjects to individuals independent of all authority but its own, and thus verges through democracy to despotism. If, on the contrary, it only assumes the supreme guidance of the corporations of which it is composed, and confines its action upon its individual subjects to those few political ends and aims which are proper to it,—military defence, the administration of justice, and taxation,—while in all other things it fosters and protects corporate independence as the very life of the state, then it verges to constitutionalism, to the true commonwealth, to the political ideal.

Thus states naturally divide themselves into despotic and constitutional. Characteristic of the one is a condition of society more or less atomic, that is, more or less divested of corporate organisation. The other is characterised by being founded on corporations retaining their franchises and immunities, that is, independent of the supreme government in all matters except those directly belonging to the state. One recognises the supremacy of the lawgiver, the other the supremacy of law. Men in their atomic, individual, unconnected existence can have no customs. Customs arise with the corporation, and are preserved by it alone. Hence the democratic destruction of corporations involves the destruction of customary law, and assigns the direction of the masses to a discretionary power, first of all supposed to reside in the masses themselves, and thence by easy gradations transferred to the demagogue and to the despot.

We may look at the state either absolutely, as a logical development of its fundamental idea, or historically, as the actual growth of an association of real men. Theorists assign two great external formative principles to states—

the constant discretionary power of a living lawgiver, and the constant obligation of a written law. An endless and unprofitable controversy has been waged between the patrons of each of the two principles, each side claiming the superiority for the theory which it patronised. But in reality neither theory has ever yet been realised. No despot has ever yet been able to mould a people to any shape he chose ; no absolute law has ever been imposed on a people according to the abstract theory of a legislator. Despots can only govern when they represent the will of the people ; laws are efficacious only when they are customs. Yet the absolutist theories have at certain periods of history exercised great power, and the notions of the divine right of the prince, and of the abstract and religious obligation of social law, have at different times done much to reconcile nations to arbitrary changes, or to the fetters of a misapplied rule. But no such notion has ever preserved lawgivers or laws that were really out of harmony with the nation which was called upon to obey them. The real despot has ever been what he is now reckoned to be, namely, a representative and organ of the democracy ; and law, however absolute in its formulas, has ever been more or less forced into conformity with custom by means of legal fictions.

But the pure constitutional state is a political corporation, including many subordinate, social, religious, or trafficking corporations. It is the great circle within whose circumference the smaller concentrics,—the family, the tribe, the race,—and the excentrics,—the church, the school, the guild, the trading company,—all have their independent existence. It is a corporation compounded of other corporations, which submit to it, not that it may do their proper work, but that it may do those works which are equally necessary for all, may defend all, and administer justice to all, while it leaves each to mind its own particular business.

The democratic atomic state, and the state consisting of organised corporations, both arise from the same primitive source. Both begin from the corporation, the tribe, or the clan. When two tribes unite, they may either amalgamate and become one, the weaker assuming the descent, the religion, the customs, and the name of the stronger ; or they may remain distinct, each keeping its own descent, religion, customs, and name, and only uniting with the other for certain purposes, which thus become the political objects of the new state. When the two tribes amalgamate, there is no distinction between the social and the political objects. There is the same unity of customs and of religion as there

is of defence and of justice. But when the tribes only form a political federation, then there is merely a political unity, while the social duality or multiplicity remains. Questions are at once divided into two classes, subject to different jurisdictions. Some are political, belonging to the federal jurisdiction; others are social, belonging to the corporations out of which the state was composed. But in the amalgamated state this distinction is not supposed to exist. There is but one jurisdiction, that of the single enlarged corporation, which has eaten up and assimilated all the smaller corporations of which it was composed. In this democratic state the constant tendency is to simplification. It gradually suppresses all the relations which unite men into corporations, and strives to unite them to the state, not by the patriarchal or corporate bonds of blood, or religion, or customs, but by the political bonds of geographical contiguity and of national aggrandisement.

We are now in a position to define the three elements of political society with which we began. The absolute person is the individual man, out of all relationship, except that of force and fear, with any other man. The absolute corporation is the family, or the association formed after the model of the family upon the primitive conception of paternity and filiation, such association having as a whole, or through its head, absolute power over all its members, and not being responsible to any higher and more comprehensive association. And the absolute state is an amalgamation of such associations generalised and assimilated till all remembrance of family likeness, or of their primitive foundation of paternity and filiation, is lost; till state unity comes to recognise its foundation in local contiguity, in identity of language, nationality, or the like, and the state acknowledges no rights of persons or of corporations except on the ground that it chooses to permit them.

But it is plain that these absolute liberties of person, corporation, and state, are most imperfect and barbarous forms of civil life. Absolute personal liberty is no liberty at all, by reason of the ever-present sense of insecurity and terror which the isolation of the pretended "state of nature" involves. The absolutism of the corporation or its representative, exemplified in the *patria potestas* of the old Romans, was as fatal to personal freedom. It gave the father power of life and death, and uncontrolled corporal chastisement, over his children; it allowed him to modify their condition at pleasure,—to marry and divorce them, to transfer them to other families by adoption, and to sell them as

slaves. And the absolute liberty, or absolutism, of the state is fatal to the freedom both of the person and of the corporation. The despot, as Samuel told the Israelites, takes his subjects for slaves, and uses their possessions as his own. The absolute power of the state, whether committed to the discretion of a monarch, or summed up in an unchangeable code, checks the liberty of society, and is as hurtful to the community as to the persons who compose it.

It is clear that personal freedom is the chief end of society. It is absurd entirely to sacrifice the essential and permanent part, the person, to the temporary and fleeting combination of persons in society, or in the civil state. The man is always more and greater than his work, and to sacrifice the man to the work is an inversion of the order of nature. The universal myth of a primitive golden age of pastoral innocence, and Rousseau's imagination of the state of nature, bear witness to the universal feeling of the irksomeness of the bonds of association, and to the aspiration for personal liberty. Some poetical politicians descant on the delights of the primitive simplicity of manners, when equality was the rule, when each family was a republic, and manners were rude, sincere, and innocent; when no tyranny, no ambition oppressed the masses; when no war or sedition was a propaganda of discord; when law and the breakers of it were equally unknown. In our society, they tell us, each one of our laws imposes on us a separate slavery. Instead of bettering us, each teaches us a new way to evade it. Corruption spreads with refinement; and if we want to have an idea of what virtue is, we must leave the towns, and go and live in the country with the peasants, the children of nature. States have their origin in the dregs of Romulus. Finance is only organised pillage. History tells of nothing but war, conquests, and massacres. "O happy golden age!" they say; "we ought to fly to thee from this gloomy and savage beast which is called the state, and bury ourselves in the country, where we may enjoy a life conformable to nature." The only historical importance of this mythical and poetical view of life consists in its having furnished an ideal aim which has prevented our sacrificing our whole liberty to the corporation and to the state. And it is controversially important only in so far as it is the logical contradiction of the absolutist theories of politicians, who give to the state the power to say and unsay, to make and repeal laws, to dispose without control of the lives and property of the citizens, and who set its authority above that of the moral law.

The virtue of this mythical view of a primitive state of nature is, that it sets before us a worthy aim of our political and social life. Its error is, that it assumes personal freedom to have been historically the primitive condition of our race. Its practical tendency is backwards towards barbarism, instead of forwards. For personal liberty is the last flower and fruit of the tree of political life. The independence of the savage, who has no wealth, no leisure, and no security, but is at all moments the prey of an all-pervading sense of fear, has in it not one of the elements of real freedom. Wealth, leisure, and thought first became possible in the nomadic patriarchal state, when families, under the despotic power of the head of the house, wandered with their flocks over the boundless pastures of Asia. In these associations man did not by any social contract surrender part of his independence to purchase wealth, leisure, and security; but the natural subordination of children to parents worked out, by a kind of organic growth, the primitive types of corporate associations, which gave the first conditions of personal security and freedom. Out of these associations the state gradually arose, either by the confederation of several of them, or by the destruction of all others before the universal pretensions of one. Where this latter step has been taken, it has generally been done under the influence of a theory as false and unpractical as that which takes the personal independence of the savage for the original datum and starting-point of politics. This theory of state absolutism supposes the state to be prior to all associations; it assumes that they must all ask its leave to exist before they have any right to be; and, therefore, that it has a continual right of inspection and supreme control over them. Hence it would follow that freedom is no general right, but a collection of liberties and immunities granted as concessions and compromises by the absolute power.

On the contrary, individual liberty grew up from corporate absolutism; and the process by which it may have done so is not difficult to imagine. When the warrior has established himself in his castle, with his crowd of serfs around him, though he has the personal independence of the savage, yet those who are grouped around him are dependent on him. Among these soon arises the old corporate sentiment of the family or group, with its natural feeling of the immobility of conditions, and the fixity of classes. But partly through the example of the lord, partly through the extended culture in the group, the individual members of it gradually inherit more and more of the tradi-

tions and rights that formerly belonged only to the group, till at last every individual has become in his own person the inheritor of all the varied conditions formerly only found in dispersion, parted amongst the various members of the group. Thus the person has become what is called many-sided; his experience more varied; his faculties more versatile; and his condition less fixed. Man now "sips and goes;" the multiplicity of occasions leaves but a short time for each experience, and the states of life in one and the same person succeed each other rapidly. This variation is found not only in the upper classes, the heirs of the feudal lord, but also in the lower classes, the heirs of the group of serfs. The same man may be successively an artisan, a navigator, a sailor, a soldier, an emigrant: he may enjoy a brief gleam of riotous wealth at Ballarat; lose his luck; work his passage home again; turn his hand again to gardening or carting, but with an acquired amount of acuteness that he never dreamed of at first, and which he is anxious to hand down to his children. This is the fundamental idea of modern culture;—versatility as opposed to the ancient fixity, individualism as opposed to the generalities of the caste. This idea holds good for the culture proper to both classes of modern states,—to the subject of the constitutional state, and the citizen of the democratic state.

However the difference has arisen, it is clear that the progress of politics has impressed upon states a general distinction into two great classes. One of these is federation, wherein the original associations out of which the state grew are preserved; where the chief power is the law, not a dead code imposed once for all, but a living expression of the habits and customs of the corporations, furnished with some constitutional means of continually adapting itself to the changes and requirements of the times. The other is imperial or democratic, where the constituent associations are more or less obliterated, where the masses verge towards an atomic condition, and where the chief authority is discretionary and personal above all law, and vested in the hands either of a monarch, an oligarchy, or a democratic assembly. The law is the natural expression of the habits of a confederation of associations, as the discretionary power of a monarch or democratic assembly is the only possible expression of the will of an atomic mass.

The law by which different races and different assemblages of men have adopted one or the other of the fundamental forms of civil existence is derived partly from local contrasts and imitations, partly from the innate and per-

manent difference of the various races of men, and partly from the accidents of the first amalgamation of the particular state. But whichever form of civil aggregation is adopted, it is always made the instrument of its corresponding kind of personal independence. For there are different kinds of freedom, different feelings of personal liberty,—one kind more akin to the liberty of the corporation, the other to that of the state. Many a man who kicks hardest against the social compulsion of custom, against the tyranny which forces him to do what his next neighbours do, admires a strong government, and thinks France happier under its despotism than England with its constitution. Such a man is comfortable in Paris or Petersburg, in spite of the spies that dog him, because he is not tied down to social observances as he is in London. The greatest admirer of free manners may be also the greatest admirer of the omnipotence of the state; and conversely, the greatest enemy of political despotism may be the greatest slave of social conventionalism.

Moreover, the two tempers are as near akin, and run into each other as easily, as great wit and madness. Witness the manner in which the social slavery of the English middle classes has developed into political subserviency to the mob in New England. Dr. Channing described Boston in 1836 as an intolerant place, where the heavy yoke of opinion often crushed individuality of judgment and action; where a censorship, unfriendly to free creation, was exercised over pulpit and hall alike. "No city in the world is governed so little by police, and so much by mutual inspection, and what is called public sentiment. We stand more in awe of one another than most people. Opinion is less individual, or runs more into masses, and often rules with a rod of iron." This is just the character that Prussians and Frenchmen give the English. In its moral aspect alone, perhaps there is very little difference between the servility and baseness of the American citizen before the imperial will of the sovereign mob, and the social servility of the English middle classes to the society which surrounds them. It is only when looked at in relation to the different political frames in which they are set, that the difference of the two tempers becomes manifest. As personal habits they are near akin, and the social servility of the Englishman becomes the political servility of the American, by the mere locomotion which transfers the person from the shadow of English institutions to that of the American mob.

A sensible observer, Varnhagen von Ense, said that Eng-

lish manners and customs were a good school to teach a man to force his way through them to real freedom. But he preferred French manners and customs, because, he said, they gave without trouble something of that freedom which must be the result of a victory in England. He only half saw that our servitude was the necessary sacrifice to liberty, whereas the French freedom consisted, as an excellent French writer says, in "*des franchises anarchiques, qui sanctionnent la servitude en la rendant inévitable.*" Mr. Mill accurately states the difference when he says that French manners tend to individualism, English to social subordination. "Foreigners generally set down as one of our distinctions the awe in which we stand of opinion; the want of freedom of speech; the predominance of caution and calculation over impulse." Such a complaint sounds strange in the mouths of men who in their own country can only talk politics with closed doors, and who fear the spy under every companion's spectacles. But the charge is true. Opinions which in France neither government nor society cares about are here made party questions, and create for themselves associations to support them; thus we get, besides our political parties, parties in religion, literature, art, and social questions. And though we are free to choose our party, and free to migrate from one to another, we are not altogether at liberty to be independent of all. We are expected always to belong to some party, and to be more or less faithful to it while we belong to it. The independent member of Parliament is a very proverb of isolated weakness and eccentric whimsicality; so it is with the independent member of society. Respectability looks askance at him; critics point their pens to prick him. He is a voluntary outcast, a self-banished wanderer, who refuses to obey the customs of his class.

Thus the Englishman, free in the face of government, is not free in the face of society. And he is free in the face of government precisely because he is not free in the face of society. Government can only be absolute in proportion as all subordinate corporations are broken up; and as these are destroyed, men are freed from their yoke, and society becomes resolved into atoms, into individuals not organised into corporations. Society protects itself against the absolutism of the state by insisting that no man shall stand by himself, but that each subject shall belong to his own group. Thus our English parties are the badge of our political liberty, as our right to change our party whenever we choose is the badge of our personal liberty. While we are in a

party, we owe allegiance to it, and are bound to keep within its limits, and to sacrifice part of our freedom to it. This often involves considerable hardship. Many a man, without any vocation to turn reformer, or remodeller of his party, only belongs to it because there is no better party to choose; if he could have his choice, he would abjure many of its strait-laced maxims and effete traditions. But he is obliged to put up with them, or the tyranny of party makes itself felt in a way that cannot be conceived by those who dwell in the atomic agglomerations of Continental despotisms.

We can trace this custom in the old English frank-pledge, or free promise,—a rule by which all neighbours became mutually bound to one another for good behaviour. This universal bail was strictly observed; and thus the severity of the social police supplied for the laxity and imperfection of the law, and for the weakness of the magistrates and kings. The rule was, that every man in the kingdom must belong to some thane's court, or enter himself into some tithing, to which he became attached, so that he could not leave it without license from the head of the tithing. Then, if any man committed a crime, his district was obliged either to produce him, or else to pay his fine. Thus the whole nation was under sureties, and every man was bound for and to his neighbours.

This system, more favourable in its crude form to security than to liberty, has left its mark on our laws, and still more on our manners. The whole system of bail, by which sureties make themselves responsible for another person's performing or abstaining from all kinds of acts, is a case in point. In obedience to this social bond, the debtor surrenders his body to prison; the ruffian keeps the peace towards his wife, whom he has hitherto been in the habit of beating, or towards his friend, whom he has threatened; the disappointed man, tired of life, and having failed once to finish it, does not attempt to do so again because he has bound himself in ten pounds, and two friends have bound themselves in five pounds each, that he shall not. He is taken out of the hand of the law and committed to that of society, which has so mysterious a power over him that he puts up with life rather than break his promise to his sureties.

The frank-pledge is an institution which can only thrive where society is strong and government weak, where the people will not let their governors do all for them, but will associate together to do much for themselves. And this old jealousy of strong governments still remains among us; we

change our rulers from time to time, lest they should become too used to rule; we keep in our own hands as much power as we can manage. We do not commit the peace of society simply to the police. We make every man a policeman against the felon and law-breaker; the officer may claim the assistance of any bystander; all are bound to join in a hue and cry. One of our oldest laws obliges all Englishmen to join in repelling an invasion. The defence of the law of the kingdom is not exclusively intrusted to its official administrators. The people are the normal and rightful executors of the law, and the police are merely their servants and lieutenants *ad hoc*.

Perhaps this is true of all societies; but it makes a great difference whether the consciousness of the fact is ever living and present as a motive of action, or whether it is a mere antiquarian theory of the origin of power. In the latter case, people soon become used to accept laws imposed on them from without, which it is the duty of the lawgiver, and not theirs, to see kept. However just and disinterested the lawgiver may be,—however devoted he may be to the interests of the people and oblivious of his own, he must always in such a case seem a stranger to them, and his laws must appear like a formal rule, which it is no one's duty but his to see observed. Such a people may receive liberty as a gift from their legislator, but they are not a free people, because they have not the well-spring of liberty in themselves. Those alone are really free who deserve liberty by creating, developing, preserving it, who look at the law as an emanation from their own consciences, an expression of their own habits and customs, of their interests, their needs, and their moral judgments. Here each person is bound to his neighbour to keep the law, and to see it kept; there the legislator alone is accountable both for the making and the keeping of the law. Hence in constitutional society, where habits and customs have the force of law, the license for individuals cannot be so large as in an atomic democracy, where no law has any force except under the eye and hand of the supreme power of the state.

There are, then, two different sentiments of personal independence,—one more fitted for constitutional, the other for democratic states. As an example, we may mention the difference between the English and the American ideas of liberty. With the Americans it is not security, but strength; not self-government, but participation in the government of others; power, not independence; aggression, not safety. Their state is absolute, their sovereign despotic and irre-

sistible. There is no immunity, no exemption from supreme control, no matter so private but that the state has a right to interfere in it. American liberty is not so much impatient of control as eager to exercise it. Whereas the English idea of liberty is independence, jealousy of interference, and the security of certain spheres and conditions of life from all public inquiry and interference of government.

The reason of this is, that in England each class has its own separate duties and privileges, which it is anxious to secure against the encroachments of the state; and it has the power, in the corporate machinery of the polity, to effect this security. But in atomic societies the state is the only corporation, the only authority, the only aggregate of forces. There is no machinery at hand for limiting or resisting its power; and the only consolation or protection men can devise for themselves consists in sharing in the exercise of the power to which they cannot set bounds. In other words, the participation of power becomes their only security for freedom. In such societies, therefore, men do not claim privileges, or *private leges*, laws peculiar to the several groups or classes, nor definite liberties, but sovereignty, or abstract liberty. Thus sovereignty of the people, ending in despotism, is a postulate and a characteristic of atomic society.

The feeling in America has grown up from the mechanism of the society and government; but in other nations the same sentiment seems inherent in the race. From the earliest periods of history the Celts have been represented to us as a people with many qualities which are solid, and more which are brilliant, but as deficient in those which make nations really great. Unattached to their native soil, they despised a country life, and from the first congregated in towns and villages; but in spite of this association, their political constitution was imperfect. Without any deep recognition of national unity, the individual communities were deficient in singleness of purpose and steady control, in earnest public spirit and consistency of aim. The only organisation to which they were suited was a military one, in which the bonds of discipline relieved the person from the troublesome necessity of self-control. Their personal bravery was unimpeachable; their impetuous temperament was accessible to every impression; their great intelligence was dissipated by their volatility; their boundless vanity led them to ostentation, to perpetual discord, to aversion from discipline and order, and to an utter want of perseverance. Good soldiers, but bad citizens, the Celts have shaken all states and founded none. Every where ready to march; pre-

ferring movable property to landed estate, and gold to every thing else; soldiers by profession, even were it only for pillage or hire, and constantly occupied in fighting and in their so-called feats of heroism,—they dispersed themselves from Ireland to Asia Minor. But all their enterprises melted away like snow in spring; they nowhere created a great state, or developed a distinctive culture of their own. Willing to accept culture as a discipline from without, and destitute of internal organisation, they have ever presented the right materials for a democratic despotism, such as they are now suffering in France.

M. Gobineau seeks for the cause of the difference between constitutional and despotic states solely in blood and in race. The Italian historian Ferrari, with still less reason, seeks for it solely in the geographical and polemical relations of states. He holds that states which spring up round a preponderating capital become democratic, while those where there is no such preponderating town become federative and constitutional. Moreover, he thinks that the neighbourhood of a democratic state necessarily determines the next state to be federative. For instance, the neighbourhood of democratic and despotic France will always force Italy to be federative, and to refuse preponderance to any one capital; and the neighbourhood of the Russian despotism will always have the same effect upon Germany, and will prevent both Berlin and Vienna from ever becoming the capitals of a democratic empire. Wherever two men contend, he says, one attacks tradition in the interest of democracy, the other defends it as a contract. And where two nations contend, one always verges to the democratic, the other to the federative form. Thus contraries always provoke the existence of contraries. A strong federation calls into being an empire to oppose it, and an empire calls into being a federation.

There is no more exclusive truth in Ferrari's system of mechanical counteractions than in Gobineau's theory of blood. A much more probable account of the differences between the two kinds of state is to be found in the original circumstances of its formation. The mediæval European state, from which we derive our feeling of personal liberty, is founded on feudalism, and feudalism on conquest. Without feudalism no such state has ever come to be. Poland was never organised; Russia is still "Asiatic;" Hungary, because it was founded on conquest, though the conquerors were not of Teutonic race, became at once assimilated to the Teutonic societies. These conquests did not at once found states; they broke up society into independent groups around the

feudal castle. There was no notion of a supreme, all-comprehensive sovereignty. The feudal lord was the highest authority, and *feuds* between lords became the highest expression of the antagonisms of feudal life. The functions which are now assumed by the state were then performed by every family and group for itself. Taxation was as local as the police; there was no imperial organisation either for the defence or for the government of the country. The history of the first crusade exhibits Europe as a continent destitute of state-government. There was no authority above the local lords. The king was only a noble among the nobles, with no authority over them, and only able to interfere with them by feud. His power was like theirs, and extended only over his own domain and over his own dependents. Hence the Arragonese could say to their king: "We, each of us being as good as you are altogether better than you." Thus the society out of which modern European states have grown consisted of independent corporations, all of which had their own rights before the sovereign state came into existence. When they coalesced to form a state, they relinquished nothing of their individuality, none of their immunities, but only gave up to the central authority those functions which were common to all the corporations alike. Thus these states were originally constitutional, and would have remained so but for accidental and external influences.

The Church first favoured the development of the sovereign states as a remedy against the lawless pugnacity of the feudal groups. She accepted from the Jews the notion of an anointed king, and thus elevated by a divine sanction a power which the fragmentary society of the time was not able to develop out of itself. But as the newly-formed sovereign power gained strength, it set its heart on independence, and welcomed the discovery of the Roman law, which at the best would have been an alien custom, imposed from outside, but in fact taught the kings that the state was the first thing; that law was a code to be imposed upon the people, not to be the expression of the people's customs; that the ruler was the master and moulder of his people, and his people the wax or the clay in his hands.

It is true that the Roman law had originally sprung from a people among whom corporations were the original element of the state; but Rome, in opposition to Greece, was from the first the great ancient example of the neutralisation of the corporation by the state. Both in Greece and Italy, the clan or community of common descendants was based on the household, and out of the clan the state was

formed. But while under the weaker political development of Greece the clan maintained itself against the state as a corporate power far down into historical times, the state in Italy made its appearance at once in complete efficiency. In its presence the clans were neutralised. The community was one not of clans but of citizens. And conversely, the individual attained, relatively to the clan, an inward independence and freedom of personal development far earlier and more completely in Greece than in Rome. But still political freedom, even in Rome, was attained through the corporation. The Italian resolutely surrendered his own personal will for the sake of freedom, and learned to obey his father, that he might know how to obey the state. If his subjection marred individual development, it gave a patriotism such as the Greek never knew, and worked out a national unity, and a constitution based on self-government, which at last gained supremacy over the Greek and barbarian world. But the Roman legislation, which was imposed from without on the new European kingdoms, was not the old law of their republican federation, but the more modern law of their imperial subjection. The original Roman immunities had been crushed out by the preponderance of the foreign elements admitted into the state; the original distinctions of the Roman classes and corporations had been ground to atoms under the wheels of revolution, and the elements of Roman society were no longer social aggregations, but individual men, with no more permanent relations to each other than those of the dry grains of sand in the desert. But European society was still organised in corporations at the period when the legists of Bologna told Frederic that by this law all the property of the people was his, and that he might take what he liked; and that what he left them, either of property or of liberty, was a concession from him, not a right of theirs. Hence the European populations were slow in learning to see through the spectacles of the civil law. They have, however, learnt at last. France is Roman, that is, imperial and democratic; Italy follows the Celto-Roman France of 1789. In Germany the two principles are at war. England alone maintains the ground of the original federative or corporate state of mediæval Europe.

Besides these causes of the choice of form of government, we must also reckon the principle of imitation. Governments seek to propagate their kind. England patronises attempts to constitutionalise, however absurd they may be. The French revolutionary wars have been justly called a propaganda of armed doctrines, as their object was to provoke

each state to dissolve into a democratic despotism like that of France. But politics are imitated, not only by those friendly to them, but frequently also by those opposed to them; and this from the nature of the case. The symmetry of Ferrari's doctrine of the *raison d'état* required him to say, that in all cases opposition of interests caused opposition both in the form and spirit of states; that not only does democratic unity in one provoke federative multiplicity in its neighbour, but that dissimulation and secrecy in one government force the government that opposes it to fight with the contrary weapons of openness and truth. This is clearly against the nature of things: dissimulation provokes dissimulation, and only occasionally elicits truth, not for its own sake, but as the most successful species of dissimulation. The falsehood of Philip II. of Spain never elicited any notable amount of truth from the cabinets which he was always trying to deceive. Secrecy also naturally provokes secrecy; a secret government makes a secret opposition inevitable. So well was this truth known to Machiavelli, the typical legislator of despotism, that though he gave his government unity, secrecy, irresistible power, and the right of interfering in all cases, he made an exception in favour of a tribunician power, and permitted the tribunes of the people to attack the government in order to point out its defects. All governments imply an opposition; it is the natural and inevitable balance of our wills and minds. The government that would destroy all opposition cannot succeed in doing so any more than it can change the fundamental laws of thought. All that repression can do is to force the opposition to assume the shape of a secret association. On the 11th of March last, the French minister of foreign affairs explained to the Diplomatic Corps the causes of the recent tumults among the students of Paris. Among other things, he said that the secret societies, of which so much was said, existed under all governments. This was very unjust to governments differing in idea from the democratic despotism of France, which admits of no free opposition, and therefore compels such opposition, right or wrong, to be secret. The government of England, where the opposition is as public as the executive, has nothing to fear from secret societies. The whole justification of secrecy is taken away, and associations can only remain secret either from a puerile love of mystery, or from a criminal intention. But the secret form which the legitimate opposition to a despotic government is obliged to assume is in itself neither puerile nor criminal, but a necessary result of the secrecy and the omnipotence of the govern-

ment. No doubt such secrecy is in the highest degree morally dangerous and evil to the members of the secret society ; but in itself, without reference to the temptations which it may occasion, the secret opposition is every bit as legal, as moral, and as necessary, as the secret despotism which it opposes.

Such, then, are the chief causes which determine nations to choose between the two forms of corporate federation with legality, and democratic aggregation with discretionary power. Both are chosen ultimately with a view to secure a certain personal independence,—the corporate independence of differentiated ranks, or the envious individual independence of democratic equality. It is clear, then, that both the corporate state and state-unity contribute, each in its own way, to personal independence ; and hence it follows that the true aim of politics is to harmonise the three elements of the state,—the free individual, the free corporation, and the free state,—in such stability of equilibrium as shall leave to each the greatest amount of free scope that is possible without injury to the others. There must be some combination of the absolute corporation, the absolute state, and the absolute person, from the harmony of which the truest personal freedom arises. Taken singly by itself, each of these elements characterises a barbarous kind of existence. The absolute individual is only found in savage life ; the absolute corporation in primitive patriarchal society ; the absolute state in Oriental despotisms. The same elements, taken two and two together, present forms little favourable to ideal liberty. An absolute corporation that becomes a state, like the East India Company ; an absolute corporation that sums up its power in its personal head, like a secret society, or the Roman republic under a dictator ; an absolute state merging in a corporation, like the Venetian aristocracy ; an absolute state merging into a personal executive power, or democratic despotism, like that of France or America ; an absolute person pretending to merge himself in a corporation, such as we see in the *octroyé* constitutions of despotic governments ; or an absolute person surrounding himself with the appliances of state, like Augustus veiled behind the republican forms of Rome ;—all are most imperfect forms of government, when viewed in relation to their effects upon personal freedom.

In the ideal state, personal liberty becomes an element, not as the original datum from which the organisation arises, but as the aspiration, sometimes taking the form of a reminiscence, to which it tends. The corporation comes in, not merely as an aggregation tolerated in the social department,

like the mercantile firms and religious orders tolerated in despotic countries, but as a fundamental element of state, as the historical datum out of which the state arose, and as the kind of part into which the whole is still divisible. Here, in consequence, the corporation has not merely a social, but also a political significance and weight, like the various "interests" which have influence in the English constitution. And lastly, in the ideal state, the state itself is neither the original datum nor the ultimate end, but the great instrument *sine quâ non* for the security both of corporate and of personal freedom.

Among corporations the Church is the most ideally perfect. It is founded, like the family, on the ideas of paternity and filiation. It is a brotherhood, united by common religious rites, like the *φρατρία* of the Greeks, or the *gens* of the Latins. It is a guild, like that of the metal-workers or musicians, who claimed descent from Tubal or Jubal. It is a school of philosophy, like any of those which traced their descent from Pythagoras, Plato, or Aristotle; and it contains under it a multitude of subordinate corporations, in its dioceses and parishes, its orders, its religious houses, its hospitals, and associations of beneficence. The Church is also, but in a secondary and imitative sense, a state, because of its unity, because of the political ascendancy it has often acquired, and because of the political position of its head as sovereign of an independent state. And both as corporation and as state it has experienced the action of those laws which determine the relations between states and corporations. The law of opposition has led it to favour the formation of monarchies, that it might get rid of the anarchy of the feudal lords, and to ally itself with independent and federative municipalities, that it might deliver itself from the danger of an encroaching monarchy. The law of imitation has led it to copy the system of the states from which the danger came; and from Boniface VIII., himself a lawyer, to Leo X., it claimed the same absolutism for itself that the civilians claimed for the emperor. Again, the same division holds good in the elements of the Church and in those of the State. There is the individual, the corporation in the Bishops and parishes, and the state in the Papal supremacy. The freedom of the individual is a reminiscence of primitive times, when all offices were elective, and all important acts were transacted in common; and it is also an aspiration for the future, in such ecclesiastical politicians as Rosmini and Gioberti. The ecclesiastical corporation and the ecclesiastical monarchy have also their parties, and their recog-

nised position in the Church. And perhaps, as in the ideal state, so in the Church also, the best temporal condition of Christendom is to be found in the due balance and harmony of the freedom of individual, of corporation, and of monarchy. The partisans and defenders of the exclusive preponderance of either element may be within their rights as Christians, without being in the right as ecclesiastical politicians. It is only in the harmony and in the stable equilibrium of the three elements,—the absolute individual, the absolute corporation, and the absolute state,—that government can be reconciled with liberty, either in ecclesiastical or in civil society.

DANTE'S PHILOSOPHY OF LOVE.

RATIONALISM and superstition are alike in this, that they confound the natural and the supernatural. Rationalism explains supernatural influences as effects of obscure natural laws. Superstition elevates the effects of these obscure natural laws into manifestations of a supernatural order. Religion occupies the place between, and is neither superstitious nor rationalist. The Christian accepts with faith the revelation that a certain washing, with certain ceremonies, is a sacrament, and is the channel of supernatural grace. For him the fact is an isolated one, and has no further results. It does not lead him to attribute any sacred character to his usual ablutions, except so far as they may serve subjectively to remind him of his baptism, and the duties that follow from it. The superstitious man, on the contrary, as soon as he hears that one washing has this supernatural force, goes on to attribute a similar power to other washings, makes laws about washing the hands and feet and face, about respecting the purity of rivers, about ceremonies to be used in drinking, and so on, as if water were the most sacred thing in the world, and as if there had been implanted in it from the Creation a spiritual as well as material force of ablution ; while the rationalist explains

away the whole doctrine of baptism as a misapprehension, as a confusion between a type and a reality, and as a supposition that because clean hands might be a good symbol of a clean heart, therefore cleanliness of hands has become an efficient cause of cleanliness of heart.

Rationalism has its proper function as the rightful opponent of the superstitious generalisation of the sacramental parts of religion. There is a certain number of formulas, partly verbal, partly material, which God has appointed to be the vehicles of certain supernatural graces; these formulas are arbitrarily selected, and the operation which they are forced to accomplish is one that is wholly beside their own nature. If these formulas were naturally vehicles of the grace, a half formula would convey a half grace, and similar formulas might be expected to convey similar graces. New sacraments might be discovered with the same facility as new machinery is invented. But when once it is understood that the sacraments are isolated facts, having no parallels in nature, "without father, without mother, without descent," then we can easily see why the least alteration in the formula does not alter, but annihilates, the grace. Thus the sacramental tradition of the Church, when rightly understood, gives no ground whatever for the superstitious generalisation which has often been made of it. At one time the power of the priest over the sacramental elements of bread and wine was supposed to be only one example of the inherent powers of the human voice; and the wizard expected by his magical words to operate changes in nature like those which the sacramental words of the priest operated in the elements. Physical science was deeply tinged with this superstitious generalisation of an isolated sacramental fact, when even Roger Bacon, cautious experimentalist though he was, could say that "words have the greatest power; and all miracles have been performed by words. The word is the chief operation of the rational soul; therefore, when words are uttered with profound thought, and great desire, and right intention, and strong confidence, they have great power, . . . for nature obeys the thoughts of the soul; . . . and the power of the soul is strongly impressed and incorporated in the voice. And the air, shaped by the voice, and having a strong impress of the rational soul, may itself be altered by this power, and may go on to alter the things it touches. . . . The four elements of power are, the voice that gives shape to the air, the rational soul, the body, and the constellation; by these four an unspeakable quantity of change may be produced in the

air, and the things it contains, if we choose the season of a fitting constellation, and strongly direct our intention, our desire, and our hope." Then he explains the folly of magic, which, according to him, expects to perform its wonders "by a mere verbal formula casually uttered, out of the season of the right constellation, without any strong thought of the soul, or confident desire, or certain intention, but at the will of the speaker." This, he says, is "folly, magic, old woman's fable, not worth the consideration of the wise, and can do nothing, except the devil work hiddenly. But if the four powers aforesaid (word, soul, body, and star) concur with the five conditions of soul (deep thought, vehement desire, fixed intention, firm hope, and good or bad will), and with good or bad complexion of body, then certainly an alteration will take place, whatever we call it, fascination or any other name."*

It would be easy to prove that this superstitious physical science was much supported by its supposed analogy with the doctrine of the Eucharist. The common conjuring formula, *hocus pocus*, which we have seen in a book of the fourteenth century, though we cannot put our hands on the reference, is clearly a corruption of the sacred words of consecration, and Wicliffe blasphemously identifies the two formulas. Thus the sacramental doctrine, inassailable in itself, became assailable through the superstitious generalisation which it suffered; though this generalisation probably began with the best intentions, with the notion of conforming all thoughts, all principles, and all science to religion, and was therefore carried on with bland confidence and with pious enthusiasm, till it became bound up with the faith of the sacraments. Then came the rationalists, led on by Francis Bacon, first with halting and hesitating steps in his Century X. of observations on natural history, then with greater security and confidence in the *Novum Organum* (lib. i. aph. lxxxv. and lxxxvii.) and the *Parasceve ad Historiam naturalem et experimentalem*, where he utterly and finally rejected all the superstitious tales of ceremonial magic as old woman's fables, and warned his readers to examine the pretensions even of natural magic with the greatest severity. He made short work of Roger Bacon's impressions and alterations of the air, influences of the stars, or sympathetic motion. He demonstrated that the sacramental generalisation which issued in the magical theory of physical science was a mere delusion and misapprehension, and thus he succeeded not only in destroying

* Opus tertium, c. xxvi. pp. 96-98.

the false science which he directly attacked, but also in obscuring for a time the true doctrine which was regarded as the parent of that science, and which he therefore indirectly combated. But, in truth, the seven sacraments, taken as seven isolated facts, selected by the free choice of God to be raised above nature, and to become the vehicles of forces which nature knows not of, have nothing whatever to do with physical science, are not only out of its sphere, but also out of analogy with it. They can stand better alone than with the false support of the magical theories of physical science.

But the ethical sciences stand on a different footing. Our moral powers are incomplete without religion; and therefore, if a religion is not given to them, they are forced to make a religion for themselves, which almost by necessity issues in superstition. The great want in ethics is a better means of suddenly changing evil habits. Ethical science only recognises one way of doing this, and tells us that habits can only be supplanted and conquered by contrary habits. But the good habit which is to supplant the evil one is generally more difficult to form than the original bad habit was. The man is older and more rigid, the soul is already occupied; and therefore, in nine cases out of ten, the natural changes of character are not brought about through the gradual formation of contrary habits by a constant attention and an intense act of will, but through the gradual dying out of the passions upon which the old habits were founded. But the soul is not content with this; it sighs for some power that can effect a sudden change; and such a power is religion. One or two so-called religious sects, like the Stoics or the Pelagians, might have been content to cast aside all hopes of changing the moral habits of mankind, except naturally, by the patient reformation of manners. But in general all religions put forward a claim to the possession of a short way of getting at their great object, the sudden and complete eradication of evil habits. They all preach some initiation, some new birth, some sacrament, which confers a supernatural power, and renders that easy which is so difficult to nature. Christianity has the true means, while the pretences of other religions are false. And the great evidence of the truth of Christianity in early ages was its superiority to all other religions in this respect. When its converts were all adults, its power to change the character suddenly was a matter of daily experience. Other religions made the same claims, and could go some way in establishing them; but the superiority of Christianity was

overwhelming. The Egyptian magicians also turned their rods to serpents, but the serpent of Moses devoured them all.

Physical science is complete in itself, and has no true or natural relation with the sacramental idea; yet, in spite of the alien nature of the two things, the philosopher's stone was to be a sacrament of chemical force, and the elixir of life was to be a sacrament of health and longevity. Ethical science, on the other hand, is weak till it is completed by the supplement of religious force. It needs a sacrament to effect that sudden reformation of character which nature wants to have done, but has no means of doing. Hence the sacramental idea has a true relation and a close connexion with all branches of ethical science, and in all of them men are naturally driven to seek for shorter roads and more compendious methods of reformation and change than nature affords them.

Among the more obscure parts of ethics, we may class the chivalrous philosophy of love, of which Dante is the great hierophant. The aim of this philosophy is not to produce a good man, but a gentleman. Its object is the reformation of habits with which Christianity, as such, does not meddle, because they sin not against morals, but against manners, and do not make a man wicked, but only make him a boor. On these defects of culture Christianity has little direct influence, for it was not intended to correct them: it leaves the barbarian in his barbarism; it leads him to heaven, not to the courts of princes or the schools of philosophers. Still these defects of culture are defects which ought to be corrected. In the age of Dante, when society was emerging from barbarism, these rough habits, though felt to be detestable, were yet so ingrained in men's nature, that it was the most difficult thing possible to cast them off. Hence men sought some philosopher's stone, some elixir, that would act upon them with sacramental force, and would change them from boors to gentlemen, from rude wretches to civil and polished citizens, without needing that gradual and patient self-education which is the natural but tiresome means of working the change.

For this purpose Dante must have carefully studied the psychological resources of the old philosophers, who were the theologians of antiquity. It is uncertain whether he ever read Plato. But he certainly must have heard of Plato's two treatises upon love,—the youthful and fiery *Phædrus*, and the more mature *Banquet*; for he has evidently copied, not the form or the details, but the intentions, of the two

treatises in his *Vita Nuova* and his *Convito*. In the former treatise, the object of the poet is to point out a new and short road to a transformation of character; to effect an alteration in the soul by means of external applications, and to perform without labour, or with less labour, a task which by the ordinary methods of self-education we should find impossible, or only possible with immense exertion. In the latter treatise, the poet, matured in intellect, and undeceived concerning the degree of change that can be worked in the man by the means recommended in the former book, does not so much seek a medicine that shall transform the soul, as an external complement of the incompleteness and want which the soul still experiences. The *Convito* is the philosophy of the end, and of the means of becoming united to the end.

But the philosophy of the *Vita Nuova* is youthful and ardent, and seeks to work a mystic transformation in the soul, by means which have thus much in common with the ecclesiastical sacraments, that their operation is obscure and inexplicable. It is a philosophy that leads us to shut our eyes, and try any means that can be proved to have an irresistible effect on the soul, in hopes that what is so mighty in immediate effect may also have a lasting influence, and may work an abiding change. The philosophy of the *Convito*, on the contrary, is mature, peaceful, contemplative, leading to the ecstasy, not of passion, but of thought, and tending to wrap the man not in himself, but in love of art, of philosophy, and of politics.

The Phædrus of Plato is in the main a treatise upon the transforming power of ecstasy or madness. According to Plato, there are four kinds of divine mania,—that of Apollo, who gives prophetic inspiration; that of Bacchus, who gives mystic ecstasy; that of the Muses, who inspire the poet; and that of Aphrodite and Eros, who give the ecstasy of love. Of these the last is the highest and mightiest in its effects. From all of these manias, “when granted by Divine bounty,” the greatest blessings arise. Tradition testifies that such a madness is more noble than sound sense, as that which comes from God is more noble than that which proceeds from men. The proof which Plato finds of the beneficial effect of the ecstasy of love is derived simply from its mighty effects. When a man properly initiated, he says, sees a beautiful form, he at first shudders, and terrors come over him; then, as he looks steadfastly, he reverences it as a god. And when he has beheld it, after shuddering, a change, a sweating, and unusual heat come over him. For having received the ema-

nation of beauty through his eyes, he has become heated, and the wings of his soul are refreshed, their pores are opened, and the places where they grow are softened, and the feathers begin to burst forth again. The whole soul boils and throbs violently; it is relieved from pain and filled with joy; or, at other times, it is tormented by the strangeness of the affection, and becomes frenzied, frantic, and sleepless, and wanders about, longing to see once more the beautiful object, the sight of which presently cures all these pains. Hence the beautiful being becomes not only the soul's god, but the physician of its deepest griefs. In the presence of this beauty, the vicious part of the soul is humbled and lays aside its insolence; and it swoons through fear whenever the beautiful object is perceived. Thus from that time the soul of the lover serves the beautiful thing with simple reverence and awe. Plato's doctrine was founded on the double nature of love. The bitter-sweet compound,—of which a mediæval poet sang,

“ An amor dolor sit,
An dolor amor sit,
Utrumque nescio :
Hoc unum sentio,
Jucundus dolor est,
Si dolor amor est,”—

was attributed to the double soul;—the pleasure which beauty gave, to the good part,—the awe and fear which it inspired, to the bad. And the encouragement of both these parts of love, the pleasure and the pain, was supposed to be equally necessary for the soul; the pleasure to develop the good, the pain to repress the evil.

This doctrine of Plato's *Phædrus*, which is founded on the natural mysticism and the sacramental theory of the psychological parts of the old Pagan religions, is also the recipe given by Dante in the *Vita Nuova* for the genesis of the gentleman.

Plato's doctrine of divine mania is clearly that of the orgies of the Pagan mysteries. The orgies were of three kinds,—those of Bacchus, those of the Bona Dea, and those of Eros: the excitement of wine, the excitement of nervous and muscular agitation, and the excitement of passion. The earliest traces of this doctrine that we have found are in the earliest extant religious books of Paganism. In the Sama Veda, Soma, the chief god, is in one aspect simply a vast ocean of glorified rum. When the earliest Brahmins took the stalks of the moon-plant (*Asclepias*—sugar-cane would have done as well), pressed out the juice, left it to

ferment, and then drank it, its effects were a marvel to them. When, in the first stage of tipsiness, it exhilarated them, and gave them a fresh flow of thought, they imagined that they had found an intelligence akin to their own in the liquid they were draining off, and they sang, "The radiance of the moon-plant upholds the intellect, which has been distilled from it."* And when they recovered from the overpowering effects of the further stages of drunkenness, they recognised in Soma a might superior to their own,—the might of the supreme intelligence, the lord, ruler, and maker of the world; and they sang, "Soma is the father of intelligences, the father of heaven, of fire, of the sun, of Indra and of Vishnu. The great overflowing indestructible sea of moon-plant juice proceeded forth in the beginning, creating and producing all beings. It is the lord of the world—the purifying spirit."† It is the "supporter of the heavens, the strengthener of the gods, the intoxicator—the green fugacious herb."‡ "With vibrating motion he inspires songs and hymns, sending forth a flood of sound. He sees the inward soul, and is the rainer of felicity."§ It does not seem difficult to comprehend the childish wonder of the first Brahmins at the might of the intoxicating draught, nor the steps by which it was made the symbol and impersonation of the great soul of the world, which to the pantheistic Brahmin was the chief and universal deity—the all-victorious Indian Bacchus. It was by this draught that the mystic communion between the human soul and the great Pan was established; drunkenness was made a religious work; and from that time the language of drinking has continued to be the secret language of Oriental mystical theology. Grave pundits still comment upon the Anacreontics of Hafiz, and extract out of the most roaring couplets the deepest mystical allusions to the union of the soul with the great spirit of the universe. The second orgiastic ecstasy is that of nervous and muscular excitement. This was the mania of the self-flagellating, self-mutilating votaries of Baal and Cybele, and still exists in the dancing dervishes of the East, and in the swooning, barking, shaking, roaring revivalists of the West. We have it in the table-turners and rappers, and in all the epileptic degradations of the American spiritualists. And the third, the mania of passion and affection, still exists as a religious ceremony, in various degrees of impurity, in India, and Africa, and the islands of the Pacific. In a finer form, it still lies at the root of the mysticism of the Arabs, who teach that the degrees of

* Sama Veda, Prapathaka vi. Dasati 7.

† Ibid. Das. 7.

‡ Ibid. Prap. vi. Das. 4.

§ Ibid. Adhyaya 5.

divine love are friendship, love, desire, ardour, ecstasy, enthusiasm, fury. Its language finds highest expression in the Song of Solomon, and in the Christian commentators on that book, who make it the foundation of the Christian view of religious ecstasy, as St. Thomas, 1^{ma} 2^e, q. 28, art. iii. But the Christian view of ecstasy must not for an instant be confounded, or even too closely compared, with that of the Pagans. The Pagan valued his intoxication because it completely absorbed the mind, took away its self-mastery, and handed it over to the supremacy of some external power, from which he expected a lasting effect upon the soul. The Christian, on the contrary, curses all such intoxication because it is in effect a voluntary surrender of the helm of the soul into the hands of some external power, which may be good, but is more probably evil. Nevertheless there is some distant analogy between the Pagan doctrine which seeks some unknown and magical power of transformation behind the terrible force of such a mania, and the Christian doctrine which discovers the real transforming power in the secret, quiet, and peaceful operation of the sacraments.

Now it was a mania like that of Plato's Phædrus, and having some analogy to the Pagan orgies, that was the magical means recommended by Dante in his *Vita Nuova* to bring about the transformation of the barbarian into the gentleman. It is absurd to look at the *Vita Nuova*, as Mr. Martin does, as a mere record of an unsuccessful courtship. A tale of disappointed love, in which the writer passes over, without the slightest allusion, the lady's marriage to another, as a matter wholly irrelevant to the subject in hand, would be a moral as well as a literary monstrosity. Yet Dante was so far from allowing Beatrice's marriage to Bardi to alter his tone towards her, that the most fastidious critic finds it impossible to guess at what particular period of the pretended courtship it took place. In the whole book there is not a trace of the sentimental grief which speaks in the old ballad, "her heart it is another's; it never can be mine." Nowhere is there the trace of a wish of Dante's to appropriate Beatrice's heart to himself. If, then, the *Vita Nuova* is not an idealised version of a courtship, what is it? It is Dante's version of Plato's Phædrus, and the adaptation of Plato's doctrine to the new philosophy of life which had been first proclaimed, thirty years before, by Guido Guinicelli, "Love and the gentle heart are all one thing;" "Before the gentle heart in nature's scheme love was not, nor the gentle heart ere love." On these texts Dante founded his treatise of the new philosophy of chivalry, which taught how, through a

course of Platonic mania, the rough soldier or uncourteous citizen might be transformed, as if by magic, into a "gentleman."

Like Plato, Dante's system required a mania that should intoxicate souls, and exhibit its power by its mastery over minds. Dante did not recommend the madness for any pleasure that might be found in it, but simply for its purifying effect upon the soul. The Sapphic thrill that he describes is only valuable in his system because it is the evidence that the heart is being transformed through love from churlishness to gentleness. He only looks within; he does not pause to consider how to gain the beloved object. It is not the possession of that object, but the transfiguration of his own soul, that he seeks. The object itself counts for nothing, except so far as it works this effect. Hence the object may be either real or imaginary, either lent or given, either one's own or another's; for it does not signify whether we light our lamp at our own fire or at some one else's. No matter whence we borrow the flame, so long as it burns. As soon as the fire is kindled within us, the source where we kindled it is of no further use, and may be dispensed with.

"God gives us love; something to love
He lends us; but when love is grown
To ripeness, that on which it throve
Falls off, and love is left alone."

So far from Dante seeking the possession of Beatrice, he tells us, in the early part of his book, that the mere sight of her was too much for him. The ladies who witnessed his confusion in her presence marvelled what his meaning might be, and asked him, "Unto what end lovest thou this lady, seeing her mere presence overwhelms thee? Tell us; for of a surety the end and aim of such a love must be of the strangest." Dante replied that hitherto he had aimed at being saluted by her; but that now he had got beyond that; that he need no longer behold her; and that he placed all his happiness in something that could not fail him,—probably the influence which the thought of her had on his mind. Then he tells us what her influence was. In the first place, she was the frost and blight of passion. No unworthy thought could enter the mind occupied with her image. And he thus describes the magical force of her salutation: "Whenever and wherever she appeared, in the hope of that most priceless salute, I had no longer an enemy in the world, such a flame of charity was kindled within me, making me to forgive every one that had offended me; and had I then been asked for any favour upon earth, I

should, with looks clothed with humility, have answered naught but 'love.'" The salute, he says elsewhere, gave him such "intolerable bliss," that his body became "like a heavy dead thing;" "whereby," he says, quite in the spirit of Plato, or of a mystic pagan, "most clear it is that in her salutation was centred all my bliss,—a bliss which was oftentimes greater than I could bear." To him the awe, the trembling, the impotence of speech, the involuntary sighs and blushes, the pallid cheek, the sunken eye and feverish pulse, were the outward sign and token of the might of the love that was working within him; seeing how it shook and prostrated the frame, he could not doubt that it was energising as mightily in the soul, and gradually turning the man into a gentleman. For do not its effects on the body prove it to be for the soul

"a medicine
That's able to breathe life into a stone,
Quicken a rock"?

The part, therefore, played by Beatrice in Dante's philosophy was not the part of a woman whom he sought in marriage, to share his joys and sorrows, and after her death to be idealised into an angel, and made the recipient of all his ideas of feminine perfection. Nor was it merely the aimless "woman worship," or feminine embodiment of philosophy, the result of some primitive harmony of human thought, which compelled Plato to make Diotime the prophetess of the love-lore of the Banquet; which made Hermas Pastor, Methodius, and Macrobius introduce the ideal woman as the mouthpiece of their doctrine; which made Augustine discourse concerning the *vita beata* through the mouth of Monica; and which made Boethius fancy himself visited in prison by Philosophy herself under a feminine form.

In the *Vita Nuova* Beatrice is not a mere ideal, not a mere mouthpiece adapted to the doctrine she has to utter, but a real force, a kind of sacramental power, operating mightily on the body and mind of Dante, and effecting within him a magical transformation of character;—taking out of him his wild barbaric heart, and giving him instead the *cuor gentil* of chivalry.

The man who thus attached himself to a woman whom he made, as it were, the guardian-angel of his knighthood, was called her *servente*: the word implied that he professed to owe her military service, to be faithful to her as the soldier to his flag, and to let her star conduct him towards gentleness of heart, as the star of glory conducted the soldier towards bravery and deeds of daring. It is curious to note how different this relation was from that of lovers or of mar-

ried people. The awe and tremor which the *servente* was always expected to exhibit in presence of his mistress could scarcely be even conventionally displayed between husband and wife. Fouqué's picture of the French knight and his wife in *Sintram* must strike every one as absurd. Yet it is a good sketch of the relations of the *servente* and his mistress. The mistake lies in marrying them. The *servente* made his mistress the ideal of a kind of celestial force; and he treated her as an image to be looked at, and to be addressed only mentally; to embody all his imaginations of what a gentlewoman should be, but not to be spoken to, scarcely to be gazed upon. Marriage would be quite inconsistent with a relation like this; familiarity would mar it; the domestic subjection of the wife would annihilate it. Hence the knight generally chose a woman who was another's wife to embody his ideal. Thus Dante chose Beatrice, Petrarch chose Laura, and Bayard chose the wife of one of the officers of the Duchess of Savoy.

Thus, even in the chivalrous relation of the sexes there was little of that daily and domestic intercourse between men and women which gives its delicacy to our civilisation. The one chosen woman was distantly venerated as a goddess, but not communed with as an intelligent being, while all the rest were probably treated with but scanty honour. For in the chivalrous period the wife was certainly not in her present advantageous position. The man who married sought a mother for his children, a housekeeper, a stewardess, but not a companion to share his joys and sorrows, or a friend to commune with his thoughts. So little was the mutual adaptation of man and wife considered, that in 1198 the highest authority in Christendom was able to recommend that, as an act of charity, wives should be chosen from a class which it would be now reckoned folly, if not wickedness, to choose them from.*

In the society of the thirteenth century the two elements which now combine to secure the happiness of home are found in a state of separation. The wife, bought and sold

* Innocent. III. Regest. lib. i. ep. cxii.

"Universis Christi fidelibus, ad quos literæ istæ pervenient.

"Inter opera charitatis quæ imitanda nobis auctoritate sacræ paginæ proponuntur, sicut evangelica testatur auctoritas, non minimum est errantem ab erroris sui semita revocare—ac præsertim mulieres voluptuose viventes et admittentes indifferenter quoslibet ad commercium carnis, ut caste vivant, ad legitimi tori consortium invitare. Hoc igitur attendentes, præsentium auctoritate statuimus, ut omnibus, qui publicas mulieres de lupanaribus extraxerint et duxerint in uxores, quod agunt in remissionem proficiat peccatorum.

"Datum Romæ, apud Scm. Petrum, 3 Kal. Mai. Pont. nostri a°. 1."

like a cow, and treated as a savage might treat his squaw, or chosen, not through motives of affection, but for reasons of interest or charity, had to bear most of the inconveniences of domestic servitude. The mistress, distantly venerated as a goddess, absorbed all the chivalrous sentiments of the *servente* without being a bit the better off for them. Her adorer paid her only a distant worship—a worship that she knew and cared as little about as Dulcinea for Don Quixote's. He did not venture too near, lest he should be disenchanted by the view of her quarrelling with her husband, or scolding her dirty children. And, indeed, the relation of *servente* and mistress could only be kept within moral bounds by distance. A near approach would introduce into it all the vice that Lord Byron paints in his *Beppo*, and describes in his Italian letters. But there can be little doubt that in its original purity, as Dante imagined it, this chivalrous relation between the sexes was the medium through which the Catholic veneration for the Madonna gradually raised the condition of women. The Blessed Virgin was the Madonna, or Lady of grace and salvation. The mistress was an inferior "madonna," or lady of gentleness and honour, of humbleness and truth. The two things were kept quite distinct, in spite of Wieland, who maintains that chivalry was a jumble of gallantry and Mary-worship. And this ideal elevation of the woman, though it did not at the moment confer upon her any advantage of position, did her at last great service. Dante first gave her the idea of her equality, or of her superiority in certain respects, to men. And as soon as she had this idea she strove to show that it was not a mere imagination of Dante's, but a serious truth. Thus from his happy thought there arose the reality of the civilising influence of the woman's heart over the man's hand and brain; and the gentleness, the refinement, the intellectual and moral harmony of Christian marriage owe much of their happy development to his chivalrous philosophy.

The immediate popularity which Dante's writings gained among women proved how happy had already been the results of the new reverence which chivalry professed for them. A few years before, neither the knight nor the husband had treated woman seriously as an intelligent being. Marriage had made her a slave, chivalrous love had only erected her into an image and a symbol which might be worshiped at a distance, but which had no real interest in the man's heart. But in a very short time the new custom of treating woman as the image and symbol of all virtue had suggested the question, why she might not be that which she signified.

And this question received an emphatic reply in the teaching of the Church, which, in declaring a Woman to be set above every creature that is only creature, taught woman that she was called upon to be that which the knight had hitherto supposed her only to typify—the model and manifestation of intelligence and virtue.

And then was seen the possibility of amalgamating the two characters of *servente* and husband, or of mistress and wife, not without some loss of a dangerous, high-flying, and Quixotic romance, but with great gain to domestic happiness and security. Then it was seen that the adoration of the “gentle heart” might well be the forerunner of marriage, instead of extinguishing all hope of a domestic union. Thus it came to be understood, that an affection between young people might be not only a safeguard of virtue, but a better initiative than interest, or even charity, to the tender friendship between husband and wife.

But this is only a development of Dante's doctrine, not his doctrine as he taught it and practised it. For him mistress and wife were different, and the affection for Beatrice, which he faithfully preserved from his boyhood, never even prompted him to seek her hand. His countrymen still profess the doctrine that he taught and practised, not that which has been developed from it by northern nations. The Italians still make marriages “of convenience.” Among their upper classes the genuine love-match, preceded and followed by a chivalrous tenderness, is either unknown or unvalued; the *cavalier servente* is still, or was in the beginning of the century, a recognised institution, however demoralised and fallen from the Dantesque ideal to the level of the old Provençal practice. But whatever may be its present corruption, we should recognise in it an institution which began in an honest desire for purity and refinement, and not condemn its present guilt without recognising the extenuating circumstances of its beginnings.

Neither must it be supposed that the philosophy of Dante, in its northern developments, is entirely opposed to the marriage “of convenience.” Such a union may be contrary to the youthful fire of the *Vita Nuova*, which makes the thrill of love the great purifying influence of the soul; but it need not be inconsistent with the maturer and less passionate philosophy of the *Convito*, which values the end for what it is in itself, and not simply for its effect on the soul, and weighs the worth of the woman against the fire of fancy, knowing that one is a positive and fixed quantity, the other a variable and uncertain quality.

Communicated Articles.

DR. WARD ON INTELLECT.*

DR. WARD begins his essays on intellect by taking Dr. Brownson as his text. I will do the same. "In our historical reading," says the American reviewer, "we have found no epoch in which the directors of the Catholic world seem to have had so great a dread of intellect as our own. There seems to be almost universally the conviction expressed by Rousseau, that 'the man who thinks is a depraved animal.' There is a wide-spread fear that he who thinks will think heretically. The study, therefore, of our times is to keep men orthodox by cultivating their pious affections with as little exercise of intelligence as possible. . . . The true policy, in our judgment, would be, not to yield up thought and intelligence to Satan, but to redouble our efforts to bring them back to the side of the Church, so as to restore her to her rightful spiritual and intellectual supremacy. Instead of foregoing thought and intelligence, and contenting ourselves with pious affection, which, when divorced from thought, becomes a mere weak and watery sentimentality, we should grapple with them, master the age precisely in that in which it regards itself as strongest, increase our efforts to enlighten the people, and gain for them the superiority, not merely in faith and piety, but in secular knowledge and science. Intelligence can be mastered only by intelligence, thought can be overcome only by thought."

In a subsequent publication I find a still more valuable remark by the same author: "We do not refute false doctrines," he says, "simply by pointing out their falsehood; we must do it by distinguishing between the true and the false, and showing that we accept the true and integrate it in a higher unity."

In proportion as any one is inclined to sympathise with the views thus expressed by Dr. Brownson, he will regard with disfavour Dr. Ward's essays on the intellect. Even those who agree with them in the abstract must own them to be singularly ill-timed, and their mode of procedure to be a mistake. For what, upon Dr. Ward's own showing, is the great error of those whom he opposes with respect to the Church? "They hate her," he says, "as teaching principles which fetter the intellect and enslave the soul" (p. 3). And

* The Relation of Intellectual Power to Man's True Perfection considered in two Essays. By W. G. Ward, D.P. London: Burns and Lamport.

how should so monstrous a notion be corrected? One would suppose, by bringing forward every thing we can to show that the Church recognises to the full the dignity of the intellect; that the only fetters she imposes are the fetters of God's Word; that she holds out for man a higher degree of intellectual excellence than the schools of the world,—even the knowledge of things as they are in the Divine Essence.

But how does Dr. Ward go to work? how does he attempt to gain a favourable hearing? He begins by laying down a thesis which, on the face of it, justifies the error. I say on the face of it; for it seems to do so, not more than it does, but more than Dr. Ward means it should. It seems to say, and really does say, that the Church teaches that intellect, one of God's most glorious gifts in the natural order, in virtue of which man rises to the top of creation, only a little lower than the angels, is no part of the man at all, but is merely an instrument, superior to the muscles only as one tool may excel another. I repeat, this may not fairly represent Dr. Ward's intention, but it does the fullest justice to his assertion. His defenders must at least admit that if the truth be in his thesis, it is there in a very questionable shape, disguised in so paradoxical a form that its friends may well mistake it for error. For some time I could not quite make up my mind whether he was contending for a truism, or delivering himself of a fallacy; I never doubted his unhappiness of expression.

But the Essays seem to me to be still more glaringly opposed to the second passage I have cited from Dr. Brownson. Dr. Ward, instead of seeking points of agreement, and common principles to start from,—instead of pointing out to his non-Catholic countrymen that we acknowledge all the truth which their several systems mean,—instead of showing that he is alive to the fact that all error is founded on truth,—seems to take a delight in discovering and exaggerating differences, and in making out his opponents to be mere fools. Because Lord Brougham speaks in a somewhat extravagant tone about Newton and Laplace, he is brought in guilty of foul and degrading idolatry, and represented as maintaining that genius is in itself a title to heaven. Sir William Hamilton, in lecturing on philosophy, points out to his hearers the obvious truth, that its main end is not so much the acquisition of facts as the development of the mind. He insists, as Dr. Newman so ably does in his 'Discourses' on University Education, that a man is educated, not precisely as he possesses greater knowledge, but as he acquires the power of gaining such knowledge. He takes for granted, as Dr. Ward does in his book on Nature and

Grace, that most men, in fact, pursue things that please them, that they are incapable of sustained activity from which they derive no gratification; and he remarks that truth, when gained, ceases to interest, and therefore to draw out the mental faculties. Dr. Ward represents him as saying, "that what men are to seek is not truth which shall benefit mankind, but an intellectual excitement and titillation which shall make their own lives pass with less weariness and monotony" (p. 56). A more unfair interpretation of an author it seldom falls to one's lot to see. Does Dr. Ward think Sir William Hamilton imagined that St. Thomas and Scotus, Catholic theologians, could hold such a view? The fact of Hamilton's referring to them ought to have warned him how little he understood the man he ridicules. Sir William Hamilton says that the end of man is the accomplishment of his perfection for the glory of God; and he advocates intellectual excitement as a means to this end. Observe that when he says, "the search after truth is better than the truth," he is not speaking of supernatural truth. "He is speaking of man *exclusively* in his natural capacity and temporal relations" (p. 5). He is not speaking of practical knowledge, not of moral, political, or *religious* truth. "In practical knowledge," he says, "it is evident that truth is not the ultimate end; for in that case knowledge is *ex hypothesi* for the sake of application. The knowledge of a moral, of a political, of a religious truth is of value only as it affords the preliminary or condition of its exercise" (pp. 9, 10). He is speaking solely of speculative truth of the natural order, and he maintains that it is only valuable as a means of intellectual activity. Dr. Ward argues in his last appendix that Sir William Hamilton must include all philosophy, not merely speculative as distinguished from practical, since he "regards the division of philosophy into theoretical and practical as unsound." In the place referred to, Sir William Hamilton says that all philosophy, as such, is cognitive, *i.e.* has truth for its object; but that the highest end of all philosophy, *i.e.* its advantage, is *πραξις*. And here he says that the practical value of *certain truths* lies in the process of their acquisition rather than in their possession. Is there any thing false in this? What does Dr. Ward suppose is the use of truths which are not supernatural, not political, not moral, not religious? He shall answer for himself. "The love of knowledge may be more suitably called love of intellectual exertion. The first benefit, and surely an inappreciable one, conferred by this propension is, that it gives the leisured classes the moral power of consistently obeying God." How? "Because of its singular power of receiving long-continued

and protracted gratification," which is a substitute to the leisured classes for that which labour supplies to the active.* The pursuit of knowledge, then, is the pursuit of intellectual excitement. Such excitement is useful for the gratification it affords. After all, the hunt is the great thing, not the game.

We see, then, at once that Dr. Ward's Essays are injudicious, not to say unfair, and calculated rather to deter than persuade an opponent. But I go further, and contend that their main position is a fallacy and utterly untenable. "The perfection of man," says Dr. Ward, "consists exclusively in the perfection of his moral and spiritual nature; intellectual excellence forming no part of it whatever. This is the one Catholic doctrine." The first proposition is aggravating enough, the second is intolerable. Certain as I am that I can prove the unsoundness of the one, I am still more confident I can show the unwarranted dogmatism of the other. I will endeavour to justify my strictures; but first Dr. Ward must explain what he means by intellect, and what by perfection.

"I must beg you to observe that this word 'intellect' is used in two most different senses. And it is the more important that we fully understand this, as from a confusion of these two senses has arisen what seems to me the most mischievous possible misapprehension of one prominent particular in St. Thomas's theology. In the theological and strict philosophical sense of the term, a man exercises his intellect precisely so far as he contemplates real or apparent truth; in the ordinary and popular sense, in which I am here using the word, he exercises his intellect so far only as he busies his mind with philosophical and scientific processes. Now how widely divergent are these two senses one single illustration will abundantly show.

Let me suppose, *e. g.*, a man in the lower ranks of society who has received, as we should say, no intellectual cultivation whatever, but who is deeply pious and interior; who fixes his thoughts throughout the day on the invisible world, or, as St. Paul would express it, lives by faith. He is constantly eliciting acts of faith; and it is a first principle in Catholic theology that an act of faith is an intellectual act. If we use the word 'intellect,' then, in its theological and strict philosophical sense, this pious rustic is exercising his intellect constantly through the day: nay, he is exercising it in its very highest exercise; for he is contemplating, not apparent, but real truth; not natural truth, but supernatural. Yet it is precisely of such a man as this that every one would say that he has not been exercising his *intellect* at all; that he cultivates his moral and spiritual nature indeed, but not his intellectual. Let me say then, once for all, that throughout this paper I use the word 'intellect' *not* in its theological and strict philosophical sense, but in its ordinary and popular ac-

* On Nature and Grace, book i. pp. 289, 293-5.

ception. I speak of a man using his intellect so far as he is occupied with such processes as these : investigating evidence ; analysing his various convictions, and exploring their grounds ; contemplating scientifically the phenomena, whether of his own mind or of the external world ; carrying premisses forward to their conclusions ; viewing a large field of truth in the mutual relation of its component parts, and the like. . . . And I may here further add, that according to this sense of the term, intellectual excellence will signify that largeness, acuteness, penetration, grasp of mind, which is adapted to the successful performance of such processes as I have stated" (pp. 4, 5, 37).

The authority of Dr. Newman is adduced. "A truly great intellect, such as the intellect of Aristotle, or of St. Thomas, or of Newton, or of Goethe, . . . is one which possesses knowledge, considered not merely as acquirement, but as philosophy" (p. 36).

Observe, Dr. Ward does not mean by intellect the faculty when employed on any particular kind of subject. He excludes from man's perfection intellectual excellence in theology as well as physics,—the intellect of St. Thomas as well as that of Newton. He does not mean any one process of the intellect, as, for instance, the reflective as contrasted with the intuitive : he means such qualities of mind as belong to all intellectual processes : "largeness, acuteness, penetration, grasp." "Intellectus" is the bare faculty ; "intellect" is the faculty in its excellence, apprehending, grasping, discerning the truth. Mere intellect may form a part of man's perfection, but "its true greatness" never can. It is not contemplation, but *intelligent* contemplation, which Dr. Ward rejects.

"We are said by theologians to exercise our intellectus so far as we contemplate, in any kind of way, real or apparent truth"* (p. 34). But what is meant by contemplating the truth ? Can there be such a thing without apprehension, without grasp, without discernment ? A little reflection will show that the intellect cannot contemplate without process, nay, without bringing all its forces to bear ; and that such process is one and the same for the philosopher and the rustic. Do we contemplate a thing by looking at it in the fantasy without understanding its nature ? Cannot brutes do as much ? Do we contemplate the truth that the sum of the angles of a rectilinear triangle is equal to two right angles by saying over the words, or by working out the problem ? or the

* Schram, who deals with the intellect from an ascetical point of view, gives as its operations, apprehensio, judicium, ratiocinatio ; and its acts, attentio ; reflexio ; abstractio ; facultas fingendi ; judicium ; ratio ; ingenium ; ingenium heroicum ; acumen ; profunditas ; soliditas ; providentia. Theol. Mys. p. 176.

truth "God is good," by repeating the proposition, or by forming the judgment? Truth is not only reached but also held by processes of thought. It exists for us only as suspended in the active intellect; when the intellect ceases to act, there remains in the mind only a symbolic formula,—the dry husk or dead carcass of the truth. Again, there are not two faculties for truth,—intellectus and intellect,—as Dr. Ward's language would imply, as though the latter were a special endowment, like the poetical or practical talent. These two have distinct objects, and may therefore be regarded as distinct powers; but intellectus and intellect have but one object in common,—truth as such; nor is it possible to conceive the one without the other. Every act of knowledge, if real, is a certain measure of philosophy; and philosophy is but knowledge carried out. The simplest conception requires the same analytical and synthetical powers as the widest generalisation, the subtlest distinction. What is philosophy? "The knowledge of a thing by its causes;" the *γνώσις διότι ἔστι*. But is not all knowledge of a thing knowledge by its causes? Do we know a thing at all until we know its genus and differentia, *i. e.* its material and formal cause. Indeed, what is the bare recognition of a fact, *γνώσις ὅτι ἔστι*, but a judgment? What more than a judgment is the discernment of the ultimate principle of knowledge? What is science but a series of judgments constructed into a system by judgment? The distinction, then, which Dr. Ward seeks to make between "intellect" and "intellectual excellence" does not exist; the difference between the two is in degree, not in kind. Intellect is nothing more or less than a certain measure of intellectual excellence. Whatever arguments may prove that the former is part of man's perfection will *à fortiori* hold good for the latter.

Let us now turn to Dr. Ward's definition of "perfection :"

"Every thing is more perfect in proportion as it more nearly reaches its proper end; or, to put the same thing in other words, in proportion as it more completely accomplishes its proper work, its *ἔργον*, as Aristotle would say. A locomotive engine is more perfect in proportion as it more combines strength, speed, and safety; the art of medicine is more perfect in proportion as it enables the student more successfully to cure disease. And my proposition is this: Our body is more perfect in proportion as we more combine health, strength, speed, and the rest; . . . our intellect is more perfect in proportion as we have a greater power (to use F. Newman's words) of grasping a large multitude of objects in their mutual and true relations. But we, as *persons*, as *men*, are more perfect, have more nearly achieved our proper end, have more completely accom-

plished our proper work, exclusively in proportion as we are more morally and spiritually perfect. This surely is a most definite and intelligible statement, whether you agree with it or no."

Well, scarcely so ; for Dr. Ward begins to be obscure just when one wants a little enlightenment. What does he mean by the "we as persons," the "we as men"? Does the intellect enter into the composition of the "we"? If not, how are the "we" men at all? If it does, since that faculty is more perfect in proportion to its power of grasping truth, how is it that this perfection does not redound to the "we as men"? I suppose Dr. Ward will admit that there is no *real* distinction between "person" and "nature," that personality is not a distinct entity added on to nature, but is simply nature viewed in its completeness, originating its actions in conscious self-dependence. Again, I suppose he will grant that the soul is the *forma* of man ; that intellect and will are constituent elements of the soul ; that there is only a logical distinction between the soul and its faculties ; that the faculties are essentially one with the soul ; and that the soul is intellect, will, and feeling. Now if intellect, will, and feeling, are the soul, and the soul is the man, the perfection of the intellect must be a perfection of the soul, and therefore of the man. It is most true that man as a whole is not perfect because one faculty is perfect. Intellect may be great and yet turned to evil, as it is in the devil, of whom we should say, that he is intellectually great but morally corrupt. For a person to be perfect as a whole, his faculties must be developed harmoniously, each observing its proper relation in the system ; indeed, as the parts of the body depend on one another for their perfection,—“as the eye cannot say to the hand, I need not thy help ; nor, again, the head to the feet, I have no need of you,”—so no one faculty of the soul can attain its perfection alone. The intellect of the devil, even as an intellect, can never be perfect, because its powers can never be exercised on the fullness of truth. The will of the lost can never be perfect, for they can never know the chief good. If, then, Dr. Ward had merely said that the man as a whole is not made perfect by possessing intellectual excellence, he might have remained for ever without an opponent ; but as he maintains that the perfection of the intellect, which is a part of the man, is no part of the man's perfection, he is likely to have his opinion all to himself. His idea seems to be that "man" connotes only a certain element which he calls the spiritual and moral ; that this element is placed in the world as in a kind of workshop ; that it has a definite work to do, and is provided with tools of various kinds, among which is intellect ;—in fact, that

intellect is no more a part of the man than a chisel is a part of a carpenter. He says that we Catholics place our perfection in subordination of all the parts to one, viz. to the moral and spiritual. But he goes further than this: he rejects from the system all parts but one. "Man's perfection consists *exclusively* in the perfection of his moral and spiritual nature, intellectual excellence forming *no part of it whatever*." It is necessary to bear this in mind, for the subordination of the intellect is not in question. Those who obey as well as those who govern constitute the State, and those who believe as well as those who teach make up the Church.

But what does Dr. Ward understand by the spiritual element? In lack of a definition, which would have been most acceptable, I must gather his meaning as well as I can from a description here and there. In Appendix A. he quotes a passage from *Loss and Gain*, to the effect that "spirit is the principle of religious faith or obedience," that is, I suppose, the religious sentiment. In page 34 the intellectus and the will are introduced: "In proportion as we grow in perfection of will, we grow in perfection of intellectus, for we apprehend supernatural truth more keenly and vividly." I do not see how any quality of the will as such can render the intellect keener, unless he means that obedience merits grace, and so enlightenment.

"On the other hand, this keener and more vivid apprehension of supernatural truth reacts on the will, and renders its movements still more vigorous and efficacious; and this being the case, viz. that intellectus and will proceed *pari passu* towards perfection, a somewhat interesting scholastic question arises, but one of no practical moment in any shape, and at all events wholly irrelevant to our present theme. It is debated whether intellectus or will be the higher power; for instance, whether it be the higher act to contemplate God or to love Him. One thing, however, is worth briefly mentioning in this scholastic controversy. It is characteristic of St. Thomas's school, as opposed to Scotus's, that they follow Aristotle in regarding intellectus as a higher power than will; yet St. Thomas says, no less expressly than Scotus himself, that, in the case of God and other superhuman objects, it is a less high act to contemplate than to love them."

Mark the self-contradiction of this last paragraph. Dr. Ward begins by saying that it is a matter of debate whether it be the higher act to contemplate God or to love Him, and he ends by saying that the representatives of the two opposite opinions are at one on the question at issue. The fact is, St. Thomas does not say that it is a less high act to contemplate God than to love Him, when the contemplation is real. He says that, in the case of men here below, their knowledge

of God is less perfect than their love, *because such knowledge is not real knowledge.*

By the spiritual and moral element, then, Dr. Ward seems to mean the religious sentiment directed by the will, through the intellect, to the supernatural, under the influence of grace. And his proposition comes to this, that the will and the intellect, as a mere faculty, may be spiritualised by grace so as to enter into man's perfection; but that the excellence of the intellect,—i.e. its natural power of grasping, piercing, penetrating the truth,—must be left out.

Against this, then, I argue as follows:

There is no real distinction between "intellect" and "intellectual excellence;" therefore we cannot talk of admitting the one and excluding the other. Again, man's perfection consists in those acts by which he reaches the "True" and the "Good;" but by intellectual excellence he attains the True; therefore intellectual excellence is a part of his perfection. If it be said, that man's perfection is in the supernatural, not in the natural, order, and that the intuition of supernatural truth is quite distinct from that of natural truth; I reply, that the intuition of the supernatural is the result of the intuitive power of the natural, raised by grace. It is a first principle in theology that grace does not destroy, does not ignore, nature, but perfects it, and extends its scope. Nature corresponds by its powers to grace, and coöperates with grace. Nature is the agent. The supernatural act, though elicited by grace, yet proceeds from nature, otherwise it could not be called the man's act, but only the act of grace in the man. The Council of Trent anathematises those who say that "the will under the influence of grace nowise coöperates, but is like a thing inanimate, and does nothing whatever, and is merely passive;" and the same is of course true of the intellect. Frassen lays it down as the Scotist doctrine that the intellect concurs in the beatific vision as the *principal cause*, not as a *mere instrument*, for nothing but the intellect can be said to see God.*

Viva says it is the common opinion of his order, against

* "Intellectus cum lumine gloriæ concurret ad visionem beatificam ut causa principalis. Hæc est communis inter Scotistas. Probatur . . . præter intellectum nihil est quod dici possit videre Deum, ergo nec causa principalis beatitudinis appellari." Tract. i. disp. iii. art. vii. quest. 3.

The following propositions are condemned:

"Via interna sejuncta est a confessione, a confessariis et a casibus conscientiæ a theologiâ et philosophiâ.

"Theologus minorem dispositionem habet quam homo rudis ad statum contemplativi: primo quia non habet fidem adeo puram, secundo quia non est adeo humilis, tertio quia non adeo curat propriam salutem, quarto quia caput referum habet phantasmatis, speciebus, opinionibus et speculationibus, et non potest in illum ingredi verum lumen." Propositiones Mich. de Molinos, Denz. 59, 64.

the Thomists, that the *lumen gloriæ* is only in part the cause of the beatific vision; and that the intellect also immediately concurs. He says the same of actual grace and the infused habits, with respect to a supernaturally good act on earth,—that they are only in part its cause.* The same theologian maintains in general that the relation between nature and grace is such that natural virtues facilitate the exercise of supernatural, and that supernatural acts may produce a natural habit.† With special bearing on the present question, he says, “According to St. Austin, the more noble and more excellent genius is *ceteris paribus* under grace better fitted to understand, penetrate, and believe the mysteries of the faith.”‡ “Again,” he says, “the intellect is raised not merely in its obediential power as a creature subject to God, but in its formal character as intellect;”§ that is, the soul is not simply raised to know God by some means, but it is raised in that very capacity of its own by which it knows; and as the soul has no other faculty of knowing save intellectual excellence, such must be the faculty which by grace attains supernatural truth. Man is perfect, according to Dr. Ward, when he has done his *ἔργον*; but man has not accomplished his work until he is united to God in all the parts of his nature, according to the capacity of each. Even the body admits of a supernatural union with God through the body of Christ, from whence it receives a principle of immortality. And theologians contend that the body is to be loved with the love of charity, not merely as the soul’s instrument, but as participating in its glory, as a recipient of beatitude.|| Much more then must that faculty, which, as Dr. Ward says, even in nature

* “Dicendum cum communi contra Thomistas lumen gloriæ esse solum partialem rationem agendi atque adeo etiam intellectum partialiter immediate concurrere ad Dei visionem producendam” (pars i. disp. ii., De Visione Dei, art. 1). “Gratia actualis et habitus infusi solum partialiter influunt in actus salutares” (ibid.).

† Pars iv. disp. iv. q. 2. dico 2.

‡ Ex Augustino de dono perseverantiæ, cap. 4. “Nobilius ac præstantius ingenium cum gratiâ est aptius ceteris paribus ad melius intelligenda penetranda et credenda mysteria fidei.” Pars iii. disp. i., De gratia, q. 8.

§ “Quando intellectus elevatur ad Deum videndum non solum elevatur secundum rationem entis seu per potentiam obedientialem transcendentalem, sed elevatur formaliter qua intellectus, seu per potentiam obedientialem prædicamentalem cum transfundat in effectum prædicatum vitalitatis intellectivæ; ergo sicut potest elevari formaliter, qua intellectus est, ita potest elevari, qua intellectus perfectior, et sic transfundere in effectum vitalitatem intellectivam perfectiorem.” Pars i. disp. ii., De visione Dei, quest. iv. art. 3.

|| Dico 2°. “Homo debet ex charitate diligere corpus suum non solum ut id quod tanquam bonum vult amico, sed etiam ut id cui vult bonum quia, licet corpus nostrum non sit capax æternæ beatitudinis Deus cognoscendo et amando, est tamen capax beatitudinis participatæ quæ ex anima gloriosa in ipsum redundat.” Bill. vol. v. diss. iii. art. 1.

touches God, as having to do with the necessary and the infinite, be supernaturally united to God before man can be deemed supernaturally perfect. We say that because Christ rose with the same body wherein He died, we shall rise with the selfsame bodies wherein we die. Why not, then, argue that, because He has hypostatically united to Himself intellectual excellence, such excellence will form part of our future glory?

Let us see how theological authority stands. Dr. Ward says: "No theologian has been alleged as opposed to me in any passage where he is formally treating of perfection." The fact is, Dr. Ward does not seem to know when theologians are treating of man's true perfection. Is it not most unreasonable to pretend to contrast the opinions of opposite schools on the denotation of one and the same notion, and not keep to the same notion throughout? This is just Dr. Ward's blunder. He compares the non-Catholic view of man's perfection *when complete* with the Catholic view of man's perfection *when incomplete*, in order to show in what each supposes the fulfilment of man's work to consist. The perfection he refers to is not man's true perfection according to his own authorities, it is not man's perfection according to the Foundation of the Exercises of St. Ignatius. In both cases perfection includes man's ultimate end. "A thing is then said to be perfect when it *gains* its proper end," says Sylvius; but man does not completely *gain* his proper end in this life, for in this life he is *in viâ*, which is opposed to his being *in termino*. "Our perfection consists in union with God," says Suarez: but we are not *perfectly* united to God in this life. St. Ignatius makes man's end the salvation of his soul; but a man is not saved, in the full meaning of the term, till he reaches the beatific vision. And this fact is most fully recognised by those writers who treat of the *perfectio vite*. They warn us that they are using the word in a special sense, that in its absolute signification it applies only to a future state. Thus Scaramelli begins his Treatise on Ascetics by proving that no one can be absolutely perfect in this life. Bail, in his *Théologie Affective de l'Etat de Perfection*, says: "La troisième perfection est celle qui consiste dans la félicité éternelle, où l'âme est unie au bien souverain par vision et par amour. Cette perfection est appelée la dernière parce qu'après elle il n'y en a pas de plus grande. Elle est la fin des deux autres perfections, qui ne servent que de voies et de moyens pour arriver à elle. Si bien que s'il fallait parler en toute rigueur de la perfection, il n'y aurait que cette troisième qui mériterait d'en porter le nom; car c'est vraiment la perfection que d'être uni parfaitement au bien très-parfait, au

souverain bien. Il n'y a point de tache et de défauts en cette perfection, tout y est exact et accompli.”*

If, then, we wish to hear what theologians have to say on man's perfection, we must turn to the treatise *De Beatitudine*. I suppose, with Suarez, that man's beatitude, and therefore true perfection, consists in those acts of the intellect and will by which he knows and loves God as He is in Himself. Now is it true that theologians unanimously exclude intellectual excellence from the beatific vision? So far from it, one of the oldest and best approved schools in the Church distinctly and in express terms contends that it enters to such an extent into that vision, that if two men have unequal intellectual powers and are equal in other respects, the one with the greater intellect will see God for all eternity more perfectly than the other.

Thus Frassen: “Inequality in the beatific vision proceeds not only from unequal ‘lumen gloriæ,’ but also from unequal perfection, as well specific as individual, in the intellect of the blest soul.”†

Observe his argument: “Either the intellect is raised in some grades of its activity, or in none, or in all. Not in some, for there is no reason why it should be raised in two grades rather than three, or four, or five. Besides, grace does not destroy, but perfects, nature; therefore glory, which is the consummation of grace, ought not to destroy the excellence and activity of the intellect. Now, it would be doing so, by stupefying the intellect, were it to raise the intellect only in a certain degree, for the faculty would in that case not be acting as much as it could. Further, as our opponents admit, there is only a virtual distinction between different grades of intellectual activity, and therefore one grade cannot be raised alone. The same reasoning holds good against the second alternative; therefore it must be owned that the beatified intellect is raised in every grade of its excellence and activity.”‡ He takes for granted throughout that there is no real distinction between intellectus and intellectual ex-

* Vol. iii. p. 430.

† “Inæqualitas visionis beatificæ provenit physice nedum ex inæqualitate luminis gloriæ; sed etiam ex inæquali perfectione tam specificâ quam individuali intellectus beati. Hæc est Doctoris Subtilis.” Tract. i. disp. iii. art. vii. sect. iv. q. 2.

‡ “Vel intellectus elevatur tantum secundum aliquos gradus activitatis, vel secundum nullos, vel secundum omnes. Non primum, quia non est potior ratio cur elevatur secundum duos gradus, quam secundum tres, aut quatuor, aut quinque, &c. Tum quia naturam gratia non destruit sed perficit: ergo gloria quæ est gratia consummata virtutem et activitatem non debet destruere: destrueret autem et eam sopiret, si tantum elevaretur intellectus secundum aliquos gradus activitatis quia non in tantum ageret in quantum agero posset. Tum denique quia ut fatentur adversarii gradus activitatis non distinguuntur realiter sed solum virtualiter: adeoque non potest unus realiter

cellence, and therefore that the elevation of the one necessitates the elevation of the other.

Viva, who advocates this doctrine most strongly, says: "A more excellent intellect, with *lumen* equivalent to two, can effect an act of vision with a perfection equal to three. So that two grades of vision may correspond to the *lumen*, and the third to the greater natural excellence of the intellect."* And he denies that it could be otherwise without a miracle. If this is not saying that natural intellectual excellence is a part of man's perfection, I am at a loss to know what would be. I need not multiply witnesses, as Dr. Ward himself admits that this is the view of a large number of theologians, and is held universally in the Scotist school. His difficulty lies in seeing how it tells against his thesis. I will therefore draw out the argument in form, according to the theologians in question:

The beatific vision is a part of man's perfection.

Intellectual excellence is a part of the beatific vision.

Therefore intellectual excellence is a part of man's perfection.

This conclusion is the contradictory of Dr. Ward's proposition, that intellectual excellence is not a part of man's perfection.

Certain theologians, I believe very few, who are not Scotists, suppose that, in fact, where there is equal merit, God will preserve equality by giving less *lumen gloriæ* to the greater intellect. But these are quite as much opposed to Dr. Ward as those just cited; for they suppose that the intellect in the one case is acting the part of the *lumen* in the other; e. g. suppose A has more intellectual excellence than B, and both have accumulated equal merits, B would receive more *lumen* than A to restore the balance. Then A's superiority of intellect would be doing for A what the greater amount of *lumen* is doing for B.

This view, as evidently as the former, admits intellectual excellence into the scope of man's perfection, and therefore furnishes quite as strong an argument against the thesis which excludes such excellence. For the question is, not what is the ground of relative perfection in heaven, but what is the absolute character of that perfection. I cannot understand how Dr. Ward can say it has not even the ap-

elevari, quin pariter alii eleventur. Non etiam secundum, propter easdem rationes: ergo fatendum est intellectum beatum elevari secundum omnes gradus suæ perfectionis et activitatis." Tract. i. disp. iii. sect. iv. q. 2.

* "Poterit intellectus perfectior sub lumine ut duo, ponere visionem perfectam ut tria, ita ut duo gradus respondeant lumini, et tertius majori perfectioni naturali intellectus." Pars i. disp. ii. q. iv. art. 3.

pearance of an objection against him. He admits that every Catholic has the fullest liberty to embrace what he calls the Scotist doctrine in this shape. I am quite satisfied: he grants all I want. But it is worth while to see what he has to say against what I believe to be the genuine Scotist doctrine, viz. "That where inequality of intellect exists with equal merits, such inequality is actually allowed to operate in favour of the one who has the greater intellect." This is unquestionably the view of Frassen, Henno, and Mastrius, amongst the Scotists, and the one Viva adopts. It is, then, well supported. But Dr. Ward does not hesitate to pronounce it "theologically unsound, if it do not deserve a still severer censure." And his reason for this dogmatic assertion is a decree of the Council of Florence.

"My direct reason for this statement is the singularly clear and unequivocal decree put forth by the Council of Florence. That council teaches that those men who gain heaven *intueri clare Ipsum Deum Unum et Trinum sicuti est: pro meritorum tamen diversitate alium alio perfectius*" (i.e. clearly see God Himself as He is in Unity and Trinity, yet one more perfectly than another, according to diversity of merits), p. 88.

So far from being clear and unequivocal, in Dr. Ward's sense, this decree is singularly the reverse. It certainly does not say what he requires. All it says is, "distinction of vision is according to merit." Dr. Ward makes it say, "distinction of vision is according to merit *'and nothing else;'*" a very different proposition. There are no words in the decree equivalent to "and nothing else." Nor is there any reason for supposing that the Council meant more than it says. It probably had before its eyes the error of those who maintained an absolute equality of reward in heaven, and only intended to define against them, as Henno says, that greater or less glory is due to greater or less merit.* The Scotists do not for a moment deny that men see God more or less perfectly according to their merits, but they say that where merits are equal, and one has greater capacity for the vision than the other, each receives the full reward he deserves in the *lumen gloriæ*, though one can make a better use of his *lumen* than the other; just as Dr. Ward with strange inconsistency admits, that of two men on earth, equally pious, the one with greater intellect will be, as a rule, the more spiritual (p. 53).

"The vision," says Viva, "so far as it answers to the

* "*Nihil faciebat ad ejus intentum quod erat ostendere majoribus meritis majorem reddi gloriam: quod et stat in nostrâ sententiâ.*" Trac. de Deo, disp. iv. q. 9.

lumen, corresponds to merit, and is equal with equal merit; but so far as it answers to the intellect, it will vary according to the greater or less perfection of the intellect. So that though the vision, formally considered as a reward *quâ præmium*, be equal, yet in real fact the thing given is not the same, because the subject in one case can make more of it than in the other. If to two persons two equally magnificent dresses were given, and one person had a better figure than the other, we might say each had received an equal reward; yet, in point of fact, it would not be so, for the man with the best figure would make more of his reward than the other, *quatenus ex tali præmio majus lucrum reportaret*. If an equally good sword were given to two men unequal in strength and military attainments, the one with most strength and skill would *in fact*, though not formally, receive the greater reward.”*

Absolute position in heaven certainly does not depend solely on merit; it is a condemned proposition to say that it does.† And as to even relative position, the Holy Innocents, strictly speaking, did not merit at all, for they died before they could perform free acts; and yet I suppose their place in heaven, as martyrs, is higher than that of thousands who have accumulated vast stores of merit. To the servant who had received power over ten cities was given the talent which the wicked servant had neglected to use; and he thereby had an additional superiority *beyond his merits* over the servant who had received power over five cities (St. Luke xix. 24). At any rate, Dr. Ward has no right to censure others for not accepting an interpretation which is not in the letter of a decree, and which he cannot prove to be the true one. It is a principle in theology, that dogmatic decisions are not to be pressed beyond the necessary force of their words; were it otherwise, it is not too much to say that there would be as many dogmas in the Church as there are dogmatising theologians.

The appeal to the *sensus fidelium* scarcely merits notice. I believe that Viva's is eminently the common-sense view, and would be readily accepted by those *fideles* who might be able to understand its meaning.

Dr. Ward endeavours further to diminish the authority against him by two remarks: first, he says the number of theologians who maintain the thesis in question is extremely

* Viva, pars i. disp. 2, de Visione Dei, q. 4.

† “Opera bona justorum non accipiant in die judicii extremi mercedem ampliorem, quam justo Dei judicio mereantur accipere.” Prop. 14, Mich. Bai. (Denz. Enchir. 894).

small; secondly, he insinuates that they hardly maintain the thesis.

1. His ground for the first statement is, that F. Compton Carleton, S. J., speaks of theologians as being unanimously against it. But F. Carleton was evidently not at home in Scotist theology; and Viva, S. J., speaks of the opinion as *recentioribus communius*.* Again, Dr. Ward says that "Mastrius, a very able Scotist, is only able to quote six names in its behalf; not one," he thinks, "of any conspicuous eminence." But can it be fairly concluded that Mastrius exhausted his powers in the list he gives? He possibly thought more highly of these theologians than his critic does, and deemed six sufficient. Now, in reply to Dr. Ward, I would say, that I look upon Henno, Frassen, and Mastrius as weighty authority, not so much as being individually theologians of note, but as the representatives of a great and approved school in the Church. Their agreement proves that they are delivering the Scotist doctrine on the subject, and as such they are entitled to far more consideration than any single theologian can claim for his private opinion. For the opinions of a single theologian may escape notice; but that the distinctive doctrine of a widely-spread and illustrious school, which has been brought forward and made matter of contention with other schools, should not have come to the knowledge of authorities in the Church is simply incredible. Again, Viva's theology is well known at Rome. Can any one doubt that it would have been on the Index long ago had it contained a proposition directly against the faith? The principle for which I contend is this;—that any Catholic has full right of holding any opinion which he thinks true and not opposed to the faith, if such opinion has the support of well-known theologians, has been fairly agitated in the schools of the Church, and has not been censured. And this, I maintain, is the case with the thesis under discussion. Is there the remotest connexion between my principle and that of the condemned proposition Dr. Ward quotes,—"The opinion of a young and modern author ought to be deemed probable so long as it is not certain that it has been rejected by the Apostolic See as improbable"?

Dr. Ward says that Suarez and Billuart have had no hesitation in censuring the thesis. The one calls it inconsistent with the principles of faith; the other declares that it leads necessarily to a conclusion worse than Pelagian. But, as Dr. Ward admits, their censure rests on wholly dif-

* P. i. disp. ii. q. 4.

ferent grounds from his. They do not attack the thesis as opposed to the Council of Florence, but because it goes against certain views of their own on the subject of grace. Besides, Billuart's objection certainly embraces that form of the thesis which Dr. Ward allows to be perfectly tenable. *Aliquem gradum gloriæ non correspondere gratiæ* applies as much to Tartaretus's opinion as Henno's. The fact is, that strong language from theologians who are biased in an opposite direction is no argument whatever against a doctrine. Suarez says of Billuart's doctrine, that "it favours the heretics of the day; deserves the Church's censure, or rather should be pronounced as already condemned; for it is so, if not under that name, yet in other terms equivalent, namely, in the condemnation of the proposition, that grace necessities,—for necessity and predetermination to one thing are identical, as the definition and the thing defined."* Billuart, on his side, insinuates semi-Pelagianism against the Lessian school; on the other hand, the Jesuit Livinus de Meyer neatly remarks, that "egg is not more like egg than Calvinism to Thomism."†

2. Dr. Ward further attempts to weaken opposition by insinuating that Frassen, Henno, and Viva only half hold the thesis, "that they are thinking principally, not of a comparison between one man and another, but between a man and an angel. This," he says, "is obviously true of the three above-named theologians." I do not know what he means by "thinking principally of." They are laying down a principle applicable to all beatified intellects; and it is most obviously false to say that they do not include men as much as angels. On the contrary, their main subject is the *beati* of the Council of Florence, who, Dr. Ward contends, are men. They all object against themselves the decree of the Council; and they never so much as hint at evading it on the ground of its dealing with a different subject. Viva begins with the question, Whether unequal

* "Hinc contendunt Lessius, Molina, Vasques et alii ex his decretis quæ vocant inextricabilia et plusquamadamantina, fatum induci, socordiam, teporem et ignaviam hominibus afferri, studium virtutis retundi, inclinari homines ad dissolutionem vitæ, laudem detrabi bonis operibus, orationes refrigescere et extingui, exhortationes et correptiones languescere et auferri, &c. 'Hanc doctrinam favere hæreticis hujus temporis, ideoque dignam esse ut per ecclesiæ censuram damnetur vel potius jam damnata declaretur; nam licet non sub eâ voce, sub aliis æquivalentibus jam damnata est, ut quod gratia necessitatem inducat: necessitas enim et prædeterminatio ad unum, idem sunt tanquam definitio et definitum.' Ita Suarez (De verâ Intelligentiâ Auxilii efficacis, cap. ultimo); Billuart, De Deo, dissert. viii. art. iv." I am very far from saying all this is not perfectly true.

† "Ovum ovo non esse similius quam doctrinam Calvinianam Thomisticæ." Quoted by Billuart, diss. viii. art. v.

intellects, with the same amount of *lumen*, see God alike? He goes on to say, that no Catholic can doubt the fact of inequality existing in the *beati*, in consequence of the Council of Florence. Having proved this point, he says, the difficulty now is to determine whether the inequality arises solely from difference of *lumen*, or also from difference of intellect; for instance, whether an angel would see God more clearly than a man, if both had equal *lumen gloriæ*?*

It is most evident that the comparison of angel and man is introduced, not as the main question, but simply as an illustration, and so is preserved throughout. Frassen even exemplifies the argument by comparing angel with angel, and man with man, and regards both cases as precisely similar.† Henno, with Viva, merely compares angel with man, to render his statement more intelligible.

Dr. Ward's second remark is as little to the purpose as his first. He has completely failed in proving that the thesis he attacks is against the faith, nor can he weaken the authority on which that thesis rests.

I will now turn to an opposite school of theology. Are the Thomists more favourable to Dr. Ward than the Scotists? As far as the letter of his thesis goes, I admit that they are; for their peculiar theory on the subject of grace virtually puts an end to nature, and therefore to both its moral and intellectual excellence. But if we look to the spirit and principle of their theology on the real question at issue, they and Dr. Ward are at opposite poles to one another. The contrast which Dr. Ward really means is between the intellect and the will. The principle on which his Essays proceed is, that there is no true excellence, nothing worthy of admiration, except in the will; whereas non-Catholics are supposed to give intellect the first place. Now, whether non-Catholics do this or not, there can be no doubt whatever about the Thomists. They, in every case where intellect and will are fairly compared together, give the preference to intellect. When I say "fairly compared," I mean when each faculty has due scope with respect to its object. They

* "*Utrum intellectus inæquales cum æquali lumine æqualiter Deum vident?*" "*Dari de facto in beatis visionum inæqualitatem non dubitatur apud Catholicos cum definitum sit in Florentino, &c. . . . Difficultas nunc est, utrum visionum et beatitudinis inæqualitas unice oriatur ex inæqualitate luminis elevantis an etiam provenire possit ab inæqualitate intellectuum, ut proinde clarius Deum videant angelus, e.g. quam homo, si uterque æquali lumine eleventur.*"

† "*Item unus homo, vel angelus beatus, . . . se discerneret ab alio minus beato, . . . et sic unus homo, vel angelus magis beatus per sua naturalia sese discernet ab alio minus beato.*" Frassen, tract. i. disp. iii. art. vii. sect. iv. q. 2.

begin with God. They say that the most perfect attribute we are able to conceive in God, that which, according to our mode of thinking, is the source of all His other perfections, is (not Goodness, but) Intelligence. Their description of God accordingly is, "a supremely Intelligent Being most completely in act."* And throughout their theology intellect every where has the preëminence. "The most perfect life is the intellectual."† Man's perfection consists essentially, not in beatific love, but in beatific knowledge. "Since formal beatitude," says Billuart, quoting St. Thomas, "is man's ultimate perfection, the attainment of the chief good, it ought to consist in an act of the highest faculty; but the intellect is a nobler and more excellent faculty than the will, both because its object is more abstract and less material, and the faculty itself is more closely connected with the essence of the soul than the will, being the principle of the latter."‡ "In this life, indeed, charity is more perfect than faith, because faith really does not touch its object; but the love of God in the *next* world is not more perfect than the vision of Him."§

Let me draw out this contradiction:

Dr. Ward. "It is plain that this fact—*i.e.* liberty, power of originating acts—confers on the will a dignity and importance quite unmeasurably greater than any other faculty can possess" (p. 23).

Billuart. "Although liberty is formally in the will, it has its origin in the intellect, through the judgment of the reason; and the cause is more noble than the effect, the root than its product. Besides, granting that liberty is more perfect than necessity in moral entity, it is not so in physical, otherwise those operations of God *ad extra*, by which

* "Illud est constitutivum naturæ ejuslibet . . . quod in ea primum concipitur ut quid actualius et perfectius unde fit quod sit radix et origo cæterarum perfectionum: atqui inter omnes Dei perfectiones, prima quæ concipitur ut actualior et perfectior non est intelligere radicale seu potentia intelligendi, sed ipsum intelligere actualissimum et perfectissimum." Billuart, de Deo, diss. ii. a. 1.

‡ "Dei descriptio erit hæc, ens summe et actualissime intelligens." Ib. dico. 2.

† "Intelligere sit perfectissimus vitæ gradus." De Deo, diss. vi. art. 7.

‡ Billuart, vol. iv. diss. ii. art. 2.

§ "Ex hoc quod charitas sit perfectior fide tenebris involuta male inferitur quod genus volitivum sit perfectius intellectivo et consequenter quod charitas sit perfectior visione clarâ Dei. . . . Respondeo S. Thomam loqui de amore et cognitione secundum statum viæ in quo amor rerum superiorum secundum quid est perfectior earum cognitione quia amor fertur in res ut sunt in se, earum autem cognitio in viâ non attingit illas ut sunt in se, sed per species haustas a materialibus, quæ ideo non repræsentant res superiores ut sunt in se, sed secundum similitudinem materialium a quibus sunt haustæ: et hac ratione amor rerum superiorum est perfectior earum cognitione. At vero vi patria intellectus non cognoscit Deum per speciem sed ut est in se." Billuart, vol. iv. diss. ii. art. 2.

He creates, would be more perfect than those *ad intra*, by which He understands and loves Himself; for the former are free, but not the latter.”*

Dr. Ward maintains, that the happiness of the soul does not consist in knowledge, but in the exercise of the affections; and that our real and true bliss is—*not to know*, or to effect, or to pursue, but to love, to hope, to joy, to admire, to revere, to adore.

Billuart maintains, that “Man’s beatitude consists essentially not in many acts, *e.g.* of the intellect and will; not in any act of the will; not in desire; *not in love*; not in fruition; *not in joy*; but *solely in an act of the intellect*.”†

I think it would puzzle Dr. Ward to find a non-Catholic whose statements are more diametrically opposed to his than these, or a school which does more profound homage to the intellect than that of St. Thomas.

The doctrine of the Incarnation furnishes another most powerful argument against Dr. Ward’s thesis.

Every thing is perfect in proportion as it fulfils its ideal, as it approaches the highest type of its species. Man, then, is perfect so far as he realises in himself the ideal of mankind. But who is that Ideal, who is the Pattern Man, who is our Exemplar, save our Blessed Lord? He is the Head of the human race regenerated; the second Adam; in Him we are fulfilled; in Him we find our true perfection. “He,” says St. Paul, “gave some apostles, and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and other some pastors and doctors. For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: until we all meet into the unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, *unto a perfect man*, unto the measure of the age of the fulness of Christ: that henceforth we may in all things grow up in Him who is the head, even Christ” (Eph. iv. 11-15). “Ye are *filled* in Him, who is the head of all principality and power” (Col. ii. 10). “Whom He foreknew He also predestinated to be made conformable to the image of his Son, that He might be the first-born amongst many brethren” (Rom. viii. 29). The whole of the second part of St. Ignatius’s Exercises is founded on this truth.

Whatever perfection, then, our Blessed Lord has in His human nature is a part of our perfection as men.

Now theologians are, I believe, unanimous in ascribing

* Vol. iv. diss. ii. art. 2.

† “Beatitudo formalis non consistit essentialiter in pluribus actibus scilicet intellectus et voluntatis . . . non consistit essentialiter in actu voluntatis . . . non desiderium . . . non amor . . . non fruitio seu gaudium . . . consistit essentialiter in actu intellectus.” Vol. iv. diss. ii. art. 2. Dico 1, 2, 3.

to our Lord precisely that which Dr. Ward calls intellectual excellence, and this, too, on the ground of its being a part of man's perfection. "Christ," says Billuart, "took perfect human nature; but the perfection of human nature requires that it should understand by a natural intelligence of its own."* It was fitting that all the natural capacity of Christ's soul should be reduced to act; but the soul of Christ has an innate capacity for acquired knowledge (*scientiam*) not less than the souls of other men.† "It belongs to the perfection of Christ's intellect not only to know all things, but to *know all things in every way in which they can be known*."‡ "It befits Christ not only to have all sciences, but to have them in every possible manner suitable and proper to the nature of each;"§ where, observe, he does not say "the nature of Christ," but "Christ." "Because," says St. Thomas, "no perfection which any creature manifests is to be denied to the soul of Christ, the most excellent of creatures, it follows that, besides the knowledge whereby He sees the essence of God and all things in it, three other kinds of knowledge are to be ascribed to Him; one experimental, as in other men, so far as He knew through the senses as human nature ought."|| "Christ, by acquired knowledge (*scientiam*), . . . knew all things which, by the exercise of the active intellect, can be known, because the power of His genius was in the highest degree of excellence."¶

Intellectual excellence, then, is certainly a part of Christ's perfection as man; and, therefore, I say it is indisputably a part of our true perfection.

Dr. Ward's statement in answer to this objection fills

* "Christus assumpsit perfectam humanitatem: atqui ad perfectionem humanitatis requiritur quod actu intelligat intellectione sibi propria et naturali." Vol. iii. diss. x. ad in.

† "Conveniens fuit ut omnis potentialitas animæ. Christi naturalis reduceretur ad actum; atqui anima Christi erat in potentia connaturali ad scientiam per se acquisibilem non minus quam animæ aliorum hominum quibuscum est ejusdem speciei ergo." Diss. xii. art. 1.

‡ "Porro ad perfectionem intellectus Christi spectat non solum omnia cognoscere sed omnia cognoscere omni modo quo sunt cognoscibilia." Ibid.

§ "Christo convenit non solum habere omnes scientias sed eas etiam habere omni modo connaturaliter possibili et convenienti." Ibid.

|| "Id totum et præcedentia docet D. Th. Opus. ii. c. 216, his verbis: 'Quia nulla perfectio creaturis exhibita animæ Christi quæ est creaturarum excellentissima deneganda est, convenienter præter cognitionem qua Dei essentiam videt et omnia in ipsa, triplex alia cognitio est ei attribuenda; una quidem experimentalis sicut aliis hominibus in quantum aliqua per sensus cognovit, ut competit naturæ humanæ.'" Billuart, vol. iii. diss. xi. art. 1.

¶ "Christum per eam scientiam scivisse . . . omnia quæ per actionem intellectus agentis cognosci possunt, quia fuit excellentissima vis ingenii Christi." Ib. diss. xii. art. ii.

one with simple amazement. "Our Blessed Lord," he says, "has and can have no other *personal* perfection excepting His Divine perfection; since He possesses human nature indeed, but no human personality" (Appendix B, p. 86). Our true perfection, then, is not in Christ. He is not our Model, not our Example! Our perfection is not in the fullest sense Christian, since it is not the perfection of Christ! If this is not against Scripture, the Church, theologians, the *sensus fidelium*, the Exercises of St. Ignatius, and every other conceivable source of Catholic doctrine, what is?

The perfections of the Sacred Humanity are not the personal perfections of our Blessed Lord! What can Dr. Ward mean? Of course he attaches to his words an orthodox sense, but their sound would have rejoiced Nestorius. Does he intend to say that the perfections of the Sacred Humanity are not really and truly the perfections of the Person of Christ? Has he forgotten "*actiones sunt suppositorum*," and the *communicatio idiomatum*? What is meant by saying that our Lord has no human personality? * Precisely this: *that the perfections of His Humanity do not terminate in any thing human, but in the person of the Word*; that that Nature's actions are not its own, but redound to the second Person of the Blessed Trinity. *The Person of Christ*, as Billuart says, is not simply the Person of the Word subsisting in the Godhead, but the Person of the Word subsisting in both the Godhead and the Manhood; † so that the perfections of the latter are as truly Christ's personal perfections as those of the former. Hence Christ is spoken of as a *Persona composita*. Hence the attributes of either nature can be alike predicated of the Person of Christ. We can as truly say of Christ as a Person that He was born and suffered, and died, as that He creates and preserves all things, and is omnipotent and eternal. Dr. Ward of course knows all these matters of faith, and far be it from me to

* "Inter naturam et suppositum non rei sed *envolas*, id est rationis, esse discrimen: ac personam vel suppositum nihil ad naturam aliud addere præter modum existendi. . . . Itaque suppositum nihil aliud est quam natura singularis per se subsistens: ac tota illius ratio et essentia est natura ipsa modificata et determinata. Sicut hominis sive sedentis sive stantis essentia et definitio non est sessio vel statio; sed id quod homini in se spectato convenit ut sit animal ratione præditum. Et cum persona quippiam agere vel aliquo modo affici dicitur idem est ac naturam facere aliquid aut pati. Est enim natura motus et quietis principium." Petavius, Theol. Dog. de Incar. lib. viii. cap. 2.

† "Persona Christi est ipsamet persona Verbi non ut subsistens in solâ naturâ divinâ sed ut subsistens in naturâ divinâ et humanâ. Plus ergo dicit persona Christi quam persona Verbi; licet enim sit eadem utriusque entitas tamen post Incarnationem non habet solum officium terminandi naturam divinam sed etiam humanam, unde est simul persona Verbi et hominis." Billuart, vol. ii. diss. iv. art. 2.

insinuate that he means to deny them; but when they are taken for granted, his argument falls to the ground.

As theologians consider that the ideal of man's perfection requires intellectual excellence in its highest degree, so in proportionate measure we find them attributing it to those who approached nearest to that ideal, the Blessed Virgin and Adam. Dr. Ward denies this, and asserts that Billuart agrees with St. Antoninus in making Mary's *virtutes intellectuales* less than Adam's. Billuart and St. Antoninus do no such thing. On the contrary, they say that though our Blessed Lady knew fewer things in a lower order than Adam, she knew more in a higher, *e. g.* that she was a better theologian than Adam. Is this saying that her intellectual excellence is less than Adam's? If I say that Newton knew less about the art of cookery than Soyer, do I thereby say that Newton was intellectually inferior to Soyer?

Thus far I have stated what appear to me strong reasons for regarding the main position of Dr. Ward's Essays as unsound and un-Catholic. It only remains to examine what he himself has to say in its behalf. He brings forward five arguments: 1, from reason; 2, from St. Ignatius's Foundation; 3, from the consent of theologians; 4, from the doctrine of merit; 5, from the canonisation of saints.

1. The following is the one from reason:

"Thus let it be assumed there is a God; that we have been created by an Infinitely Holy Being, to whom we owe absolutely and without exception every thing which we have, every thing which we hope, every thing which we are. The more we ponder on this truth, the more we shall regard it as a self-evident maxim that we reach our perfection in proportion as we are more prompt at every moment of our life to obey His commands and follow His preference. But, as I have already urged in a different connexion, such promptitude is simply the perfection of our moral and spiritual nature; it is obtained by constant discipline of the will, and cannot possibly be obtained in any other way. Hence man's perfection is the perfection of his moral and spiritual nature" (p. 22).

The fallacy here is most apparent. It consists in assuming that promptitude is perfection because it leads thereto. The argument is: promptitude alone is perfection, and promptitude is only in the will, therefore in the will, not in the intellect, lies our perfection; but promptitude is not perfection, for perfection means something more than willingness to do; it means actual performance. It consists not in trying to keep, but in keeping, God's commandments, in truly fulfilling His will. Bearing this in mind, we can form a counter-argument thus:

"We have been created by an Infinitely Wise Being in his image, to reflect his attributes, so far as he has given us the power of so doing. The more we ponder on this truth, the more we shall regard it as a self-evident maxim, that God, having given us intelligence as a part of ourselves, wills that we should attain intellectual as well as moral excellence,—should be wise as well as good."

Dr. Ward contends that because the will is immeasurably higher than any other faculty, being that by which we originate acts, therefore man's perfection is perfection of the will. But is not the freedom of the will due in great measure to the intellect? However that may be, it is not enough to prove that the will is the highest faculty; it must then be proved to be the *only* faculty connoted by the term "man" before we can legitimately infer that it alone constitutes man's perfection. So long as "man" stands for intellect as well as will, logic must persist in concluding that man's perfection is not only perfection of the will, but also of the intellect.

2. Dr. Ward appeals to the Foundation of the Exercises of St. Ignatius:

"'Man has been created that he may praise the Lord his God, and show Him reverence and serve Him, and by means of this save his soul.' Now it will be admitted by all that man arrives at his personal perfection in proportion as he achieves the end for which he has been created. According to St. Ignatius, therefore, he arrives at his personal perfection in proportion as he is more prompt and disposed to praise, reverence, and serve God. But he is more prompt and disposed to do these things in proportion as he has more accustomed himself to live in the constant remembrance of God, or in other words, in proportion as he has more sedulously cultivated his moral and spiritual nature. Hence, according to St. Ignatius, man arrives more nearly to his personal perfection precisely in proportion as he more sedulously cultivates piety and spirituality" (pp. 7, 8).

There is here the same confusion of means and ends as in the last argument. According to St. Ignatius, we are created to save our souls by serving God. But we do serve God in cultivating our intellectual as well as our moral nature, and salvation implies beatific knowledge as well as beatific love. Again,

"Let me suppose any one to admit that we should be indifferent between health and sickness, between wealth and poverty; he certainly will not deny that we should be equally indifferent between great and small intellectual power. Or if any one were to attempt so strange a distinction, St. Ignatius's words would preclude the comment; for he says that in all other things we are to act

similarly, wishing and choosing those which more conduce to our true end. Intellectual power, I say, just as bodily health or temporal well-being, is to be desired just in so much as it may be the means of our spiritual perfection" (p. 8).

There is not the least parallel between mere external goods, accidental states of the body, and an essential faculty of the soul. We may turn intellect to evil, but *of its own nature* it leads to our end, Truth. Besides, the passage is irrelevant; for St. Ignatius is not considering the nature of man's perfection in itself, but the means of its acquirement.

3. Next in order is the argument from St. Thomas and theologians :

"He (*i. e.* St. Thomas) tells us that the perfection of Christian life consists essentially in love for God and man, instrumentally in practising the Evangelical Councils."

St. Thomas is speaking of the Christian life *on earth*, which is not man's truest perfection. Where he considers the latter, he makes it consist essentially in knowledge, and not in love. The same is true of other theologians. Viva says, while we are *in viâ* we ought to know in order to love, because love merits life eternal, and *so* is more perfect and desirable. But love *in viâ* is desirable for the sake of the beatific vision, and the beatific vision is desirable for its own sake.*

4. Next comes the argument from merit :

"It will be admitted (1) that those acts which God most approves in us must be those which most lead to the end for which He created us ; and (2) that those to which He has promised a Heavenly Reward must be those which He most approves. Now what are those acts to which He has promised a Heavenly Reward ? Free supernatural acts of the will, and none others whatever" (p. 10).

Again means and end are confused together. The question is, not "What is the title to perfection?" but "What *is* perfection?" Merit is not the same as perfection ; for the blessed are perfect in heaven, but cannot merit. God of course only approves *for reward* free acts of the will ; for such alone are in our power to give or withhold ; but He approves all that He sees in us of good. All His gifts are good ; not the least of which is intellectual excellence. Even the unjust steward in the parable is commended because he acted prudently. Here we have an instance of an intel-

* "In via debere nos intelligere ut amemus quia amor est meritorius vitæ æternæ atque ideo perfectior et appetibilior. Sed amor viæ appetibilis est propter visionem beatam ; visio autem beata est per se appetibilis." Viva, pars ii. dis. i. de Beatitudine.

lectual virtue, even in the midst of vice, held up as a subject of praise.

5. As Dr. Ward says, the argument from the canonisation of saints is merely a development of the last. And the answer just given will fully meet it. The process of canonisation proposes to ascertain whether a man has so conducted himself on earth as to afford the Church warrant for declaring him a saint in heaven. The constituents of man's ultimate perfection would be wholly beside the scope of such an investigation, though the Church would require that the person should have used all his faculties, whatever they might have been, to the greater glory of God.

These seem to be all the arguments Dr. Ward has supplied in behalf of a thesis which is certainly very far from self-evident. Whether that thesis can stand any the better for such support I must leave others to decide.

Before taking my leave of Dr. Ward, I would submit to his consideration a few quotations which show, I think, that if non-Catholics are alive to the claims of intellect, at least they are not indifferent to those of the will. I have chosen them from authors who are fair representatives of the class against which I conceive he mainly intends to direct his strictures. I will begin with Sir William Hamilton, who says, "Should physiology ever succeed in reducing the facts of intelligence to phenomena of matter, *philosophy would be subverted* in the subversion of *its three great objects*,—God, Free-will, and Immortality. True wisdom would then consist, not in speculation, but in repressing thought during our brief transit from nothingness to nothingness. For why? Philosophy would have become a meditation, not merely of death, but of annihilation; the precept, '*Know thyself*' would have been replaced by the terrific oracle to Œdipus—

'Mayst thou ne'er know the truth of what thou art;'

and the final recompense of our scientific curiosity would be wailing deeper than Cassandra's for the ignorance that saved us from despair." "The second quotation is from Kant; it finely illustrates the influences of material and mental studies by contrasting them in reference to the *very noblest object* of either, and the passage is worthy of your attention, not only for the soundness of its doctrine, but for the natural and unsought-for sublimity of its expression: 'Two things there are which, the oftener and the more steadfastly we consider, fill the mind with an ever-new, an ever-rising admiration and reverence,—the starry heaven above, *the Moral Law within*. . . . The other elevates my worth as an intelligence even

without limit ; and this through my personality, in which the moral law reveals a faculty of life independent of my animal nature, nay, of the whole material world ;—at least, if it be permitted to infer as much from the regulation of my being which a conformity with that law exacts ; proposing *as it does my moral worth for the absolute end of my activity*, conceding no compromise of its imperative to a necessitation of nature, and spurning in its infinity the conditions and boundaries of my present transitory life.”*

In the first of these quotations Sir William Hamilton distinctly says that the three great objects of philosophy are God, Free-will, and the Immortality of the soul. In the second he speaks of the moral sense as the noblest object of mental philosophy, and quotes with marked approval a sublime passage from Kant on the moral law. Observe, that philosopher speaks of “moral worth” as “the absolute end of my activity.” How, then, can Dr. Ward maintain that Sir William Hamilton’s doctrine is, that the great object and end of philosophy is the pleasure arising from mental excitement? If it were so, how should materialism subvert philosophy? Why should ignorance alone prevent us from wailing deeper than Cassandra’s, and be necessary to save us from despair? On the contrary, “let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die,” ought in that case to be in the mouths of intellectual as well as physical gluttons. These quotations quite meet all that Dr. Ward advances in his last appendix.

Dr. Whewell as fairly represents the physical and mathematical school of philosophy as Sir William Hamilton the metaphysical. The following is his notion of intellectual excellence: “In the notion of wisdom we include not only, as in prudence, a right selection of means for an assumed end, but also a right selection of the ends. However prudent a man may be in seeking his interest, he is not wise if in doing this he neglect a truer end of human action. Wisdom is the habit by which we select right means for right ends. We approve and admire prudence *relatively* to its end ; we approve and admire wisdom absolutely. We commend the prudent man as taking the best course for his purpose ; but we do not necessarily agree with him in his estimate of his object. We venerate the wise man as one knowing better than we do the true object of action, as well as the means of approaching it. Wisdom is a cardinal virtue, like benevolence, justice, truth, purity ; and with reference to the first as well as the other four, human dispositions are

* Sir William Hamilton’s Lectures on Metaphysics, lect. ii. 37-39.

good as they partake of the cardinal virtue. *Wisdom is the complete idea of intellectual excellence*, as benevolence, justice, truth, and purity, are of moral excellence.”*

I now turn to a very different kind of author. Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton has just published a novel, with the express object of illustrating the philosophy of Maine de Biran. His point is to show that man’s highest perfection lies in the spiritual and religious element; that, divested of this, man is on a level with the beasts that perish. He says, “ ‘There are not only two principles opposed to each other in man, there are three. For there are in him three lives and three orders of faculties. Though all should be in accord and in harmony between the sensitive and the active faculties which constitute man, there would still be a nature superior, a third life which would not be satisfied; which would make felt (*ferait sentir*) the truth that there is another happiness, another wisdom, another perfection, at once above the greatest human happiness, above the highest wisdom, or intellectual and moral perfection, of which the human being is susceptible.’ . . . ‘Christianity alone embraces the whole man. It dissimulates none of the vices of his nature, and avails itself of his miseries and his weakness, in order to conduct him to his end, in showing him all the want that he has of a succour more exalted.’ In the passages thus quoted I imply one of the objects for which this tale has been written; and I cite them with a wish to acknowledge one of those priceless obligations which writings the lightest and most fantastic often incur to reasoners the most serious and profound.”†

My last quotation shall be one from the *In Memoriam* of Tennyson :

“ Who loves not knowledge ? Who shall rail
Against her beauty ? May she mix
With men and prosper ! Who shall fix
Her pillars ? Let her work prevail.

But on her forehead sits a fire :
She sets her forward countenance
And leaps into the future chance,
Submitting all things to desire.

Half-grown as yet, a child and vain—
She cannot fight the fear of death.
What is she, cut from love and faith,
But some wild Pallas from the brain

Of Demon ? fiery hot to burst
All barriers in her onward race
For power. *Let her know her place ;
She is the second, not the first.*

* Elements of Morality, b. xi. p. 152.

† Preface to *A Strange Story*, by the author of “ Rienzi,” &c.

A higher hand must make her mild,
 If all be not in vain ; and guide
 Her footsteps, moving side by side
 With wisdom, like the younger child :

*For she is earthly of the mind,
 But wisdom heavenly of the soul.*

O friend, who camest to thy goal
 So early leaving me behind,

I would the great world grew like thee,
 Who grewest not alone in power
 And knowledge, but from hour to hour

In reverence and in charity." *In Memoriam*, cxii.

Evidence of a like import might, I doubt not, be multiplied to almost any extent ; but the above samples are amply sufficient. I cannot, however, help reminding Dr. Ward that it was probably from the non-Catholic Butler that he first learnt the supremacy of conscience ; at any rate, in no writer is that doctrine more distinctly and forcibly taught.

The sum of what I have said against the thesis of the Essays amounts to this : 1. I regard it as unsound because based on an unreal distinction between intellectus and "intellect." I believe intellectus and intellect are essentially one and the same thing. Dr. Ward, in fact, knows no excellence except that of the will. He cannot, in the face of St. Thomas and his school, quite say that this is the one doctrine of the Church ; so he catches at an apparent distinction between the "intellectus" of theology and the "intellect" of popular language, and thereby proposes to escape many a damning quotation. The distinction being invalid, such mode of evasion is precluded. 2. I look on the thesis as a fallacy, because it deals with the technical and relative perfection of this life, instead of the absolute and true perfection of the next. A man may be called truly perfect in this life, with reference to others ; with reference to himself, at other times ; and as approaching his end ; but perfect absolutely, in the sense of having fulfilled the end of his creation, no man can be called until he has entered the beatific vision. 3. I regard the thesis as unsound, because it is opposed to reason ; to the very notion of man ; to the language of theologians ; to the Catholic doctrine which represents our Blessed Lord as "the Pattern Man"—the ideal of our true perfection. Nor can I discover any force in what Dr. Ward advances in its favour.

Further, although I believe no man strives more—is more "prompt," as he would say,—to do an opponent justice than Dr. Ward, he seems to me very far from having reached "perfection" in that way. He never seems to remember that

the non-assertion of a truth is not the same thing as its denial ; and that marks of interior piety and ascetical directions are scarcely to be expected in a course of lectures on philosophy. Charity presumes good intentions ; the *onus probandi* lies with those who deny them. When we have no reason for suspecting an author's moral character, when he declares the purport of his philosophy to be the maintenance of the great objects of religion, it is scarcely in accordance with charity to choose an interpretation, if another be open to us, which presupposes him a selfish intellectual glutton, who teaches his disciples to place their end in the creature rather than in the Creator.

O. S. F.

GALILEO AND MENDELSSOHN.

GALILEO and Mendelssohn have nothing in common except genius. But the letters of Mendelssohn, lately translated by Lady Wallis, make us acquainted with a man who identified himself with his art so as to make a kind of conscience of it ; and the life of Galileo just published by M. Philariète Chasles exhibits to us a philosopher who so little identified himself with his philosophy as to be ready to abjure it on occasion, to play fast and loose with it, and to have no conscience about it at all. The two together suggest a question, how far earnestness and conscience in art and philosophy are necessary to make a great artist and a great philosopher.

By earnestness I do not mean a severe and serious way of regarding the world, or a lachrymose view of men, such as characterised the crying philosopher of antiquity ; nor by the absence of earnestness do I mean a jocular or ironical manner of treating all events, such as the laughing philosopher exhibited. The earnest poet may be very merry or satirical, and the poet who is not in earnest may be very pathetic. Both may shed tears and smile through them, both may laugh with a sad heart. Singing for grief, as others sing for joy, does not make the difference between earnestness and the absence of it. It is not in the way in which objects affect them that the two kinds of artists differ, but in the way in which they respectively regard their art, and in the consciousness or the unconsciousness with which they put forth their powers.

In the cradle of art and philosophy, this unconsciousness pervades all thought ; men are poets without knowing the

difference between poetry and prose; they are eloquent without having learned a single rule of rhetoric; they reason well, though they never heard of a single law of logic; and they discover and invent without needing the apparatus of Bacon's *Organum*. Man puts forth what is in him, as a tree puts forth its leaves and fruit, not upon theory, not because he has found that there exists a corresponding want in society, but simply because the fire burns within him, and because nature forces him to get rid of the embarrassment of an overflowing exchequer of thought. But when art has grown, its territory is parceled out, all its occupied spaces are drawn upon the map, and discoverers know exactly the limits within which they have to make their discoveries. Rule and line are to some extent substituted for instinct and happy guess. Theory takes the place of inspiration. The two kinds of artistic and philosophic genius which correspond to these two conditions of art and knowledge are found to exist all down the stream of time. Every remarkable man belongs to one or the other of the two classes. In one the genius is rather born than made, in the other made rather than born. In one it comes more by inspiration, in the other more by labour. Hence in one it is a gift, in the other an acquisition. To one, genius seems more like a participation in the common wealth of the world, in the air or the water, or the sunshine, to which all are equally entitled, though all cannot equally use them; to the other, genius seems more like private property, the gain of one's own toil. This seems to be the key to the differences of the conduct of men of either class with regard to their genius and their art. One class is characterised by prodigality, the other by economy. As no one is sparing of air or sunshine, so no man who belongs to the former class economises his genius. Rather he squanders it with the same unconsciousness of its limits as that of the glutton when he squanders his health, or the spendthrift his estate. Or, to use an illustration that implies no moral blame, the genius of the first kind goes forth like the sun, rejoicing in its strength, dropping carelessly its jewels, flinging about its wealth with reckless prodigality or generous profusion, without staying to inquire who picks them up. The genius of the second kind, on the contrary, is economised like an income, which, however great, is soon spent, and is nursed as a man nurses his health when once he has become aware of its ticklish conditions. To such a genius the prodigality of nature is unfit. It must be managed as a wise steward manages a property, its incomings and its out-

goings must be properly balanced, and the law of mine and thine must be rigidly enforced against encroachers. Hence the genius of the first kind is spontaneous, impulsive, original, creative of new laws rather than obedient to old ones ; while the genius of the second kind is disciplined, subject to rule, imitative, and a follower of laws that others have discovered, rather than a discoverer of new ones. The first makes things which seem to have grown, the second results in something which has the air of manufacture. The first is more impersonal than the second. The first seems more like a nation's thought speaking through one person's mouth, the second more like a person speaking his own thoughts to a nation. The first is generalised, the second is concentrated. The first has no conscience of personal dignity, the second is wrapped up in it. The first is an arrant thief, the second is scrupulously just in all its dealings. The first, as being impersonal, accommodates itself to the people, the second proudly holds itself aloof, and would sacrifice fortune, and perhaps even life, rather than bow to the mob. The first will strive to please the childishness of children and the folly of fools, the second will only appeal to the judgment of cultivated men. The first is popular, the second refined. The first appropriates all men's thoughts, and uses all the flotsam and jetsam which the waves of public life throw up, without inquiring to whom it belongs ; the second stickles for originality, and is particular about picking the mark out of the secondhand clothes before it wears them. Again, as no man sets himself to decorate the elements,—the air, or the waters, or the light,—but only seeks to improve his own property, so the genius of the first kind never regards his art or his science as the ultimate object of his life ; the genius of the second kind does so. A man of the first class is actuated by common motives, and does not differ from other men in his estimate of the usual objects of human endeavour ; a man of the second class enshrines his genius in the highest place, makes his art the supreme end of life, does not use it as a mere instrument for attaining other ends, but makes it the ideal, the arbiter, and the rule of action. Hence the first does not mind exhibiting art or science in unworthy and ridiculous positions, while the second is careful of the dignity both of art and artist. The first strives to make a family, a house, or a name ; the second strives to advance art or science. Hence the first has no artistic or scientific conscience, but sacrifices art to every whim ; he keeps art widely apart from morals, and sees no right or wrong in it, but only fitness or unfitness, beauty or deformity. But the

second makes art a conscience, confounds it with ethics, and looks upon things artistically or scientifically bad or untrue as morally degrading also. Hence the first is characterised by artistic humility, or at least by thoughtlessness and unselfishness that easily does duty for humility; while the second is characterised by artistic pride and intense self-consciousness.

And the two kinds of genius are not only unlike in themselves, but in the influence which they have on the ruck of followers who have no genius, but only seek to pass for having it. The first called into being the rough German-student type of the storm-and-stress commotion that followed the publication of Schiller's *Robbers*. The affectation of fastness and idleness is the evident way of showing that one's acquirements are due to nature, and not to art. Hence the slouched-hat school of slovenly, unwashed, bearded, smoking, rollicking, genial, tipsy, quarrelsome, and passionate students, who think it more important to show that their works cost them little labour than to show any excellence in their works. But the hangers-on of the second kind of genius are in every way more respectable; cleanly, shaved, gentleman-like, industrious, pedantic, squeamish, and touchy, they devote themselves to the perfecting of an infinitesimal portion of the mass of knowledge or art; they live like respectable members of society; and if in an inner shrine they sacrifice to some deity of their own, some private Apollo that no one else ever heard of or cares for, their enthusiasm is a harmless flame, which amuses them and does not burn others, and is far from threatening to set the Thames on fire. They may be amateurs without *amour*, and connoisseurs without *connaissance*, but their worst fault is their tediousness and affectation; and this is a good exchange for the bellowing brutality of the other school. Not that the two kinds of genius can be estimated by their followers. Both kinds are real, both produce sublime and profound effects. One produces a natural, the other an artificial sublimity. The followers of the two agree in counterfeiting the sublimity or the depth, in inventing something that sounds like it, or that conventionally passes for it. But they can neither counterfeit the nature of one, nor the art of the other. Nature, purity, perspicuity, and simplicity cannot be affected; they do not walk in the clouds, or mask themselves in impenetrable disguise; where they are present they are evident to all, and where they are not evident they do not exist. The affectation of art is equally self-contradictory. The tendency of true art is to conceal itself;

the tendency of affected art is only to pretend to conceal itself with a sort of modesty, like that of Camilla, which, "*se cupit ante videri*," or like the coy charity which has invented the publicity of subscription-lists in order to prevent the left hand from knowing what the right hand gives.

Mendelssohn was an instance of a genius of the second kind, all the more striking from the freshness and youthfulness of his character. He had all the precocity of the Hebrew race; he was the son of a literary father, and had enjoyed all the advantages of the education of a literary and observant domestic circle; he was an accomplished gentleman; and, even in his teens, he was a great composer, a musician almost of the highest order. Nature had been prodigal of her gifts to him, and he improved nature by economising her bounty. He did not let his talents run to seed, and scatter their fruit at haphazard, but he diligently surveyed his ground, and determined what parts to cultivate, and what to leave wild. He clearly intended to begin where Beethoven left off, and expected that Cherubini, who sneezed at Beethoven's later works, would sneeze at his too. He was imitative, and chose his models with precision and decision. Bach was his great storehouse of subjects and forms. If he wanted a religious theme, he would go to Bach's corale-book; but he was not musical pre-Raphaelite enough to go back to the sources whence the corale-makers drew their inspiration. The old unmeasured church-melodies had not music for him. Some of them which had been used by Bach, such as the intonation of the *Credo* at Mass, he liked; these he seems to have valued highly as subjects for counterpoint, without having much appreciation of their melodic worth. After noting some antiphons, and some fragments of the chants of the Passion (which he writes with incorrect accentuation), he says, "I cannot help it, but I own it does irritate me to hear such holy and touching words sung to such dull, drawling music. They say it is *canto fermo*, Gregorian, &c.; no matter. If at that period there was neither the feeling nor the capability to write in a different style, at all events we have now the power to do so. . . . Why make the words sound a mere formula? . . . There is no false expression in it, because there is none of any kind. . . . A hundred times during the ceremony I was driven wild by such things as these; and then came people in a state of ecstacy, saying how splendid it had all been."

Here was an exclusiveness only inferior to that of the exclusive admirers of the Gregorian chant. Mendelssohn

rejected its forms as the products of a barbarous age of the art; but he seems to have forgotten that art generally requires some slight reminiscence of barbarism, some touch of nature, to prove our kindred with unsophisticated man. There are many lessons in melody and musical declamation to be learned from the old hymns and antiphons; and Mendelssohn might have been a better melodist if he had studied them with more patience. They are the real foundations of the corales he so much admired. But he did not dig lower than the stratum immediately above them, and thought he had gone low enough for the foundations of his art when he came to Martin Luther's measured hymn-tunes.

Besides his exact knowledge of the place he was to occupy in the field of his art, Mendelssohn had most of the other characteristics of the self-conscious artist. He looked upon his art with such earnestness that he failed to distinguish between moral baseness and defective artistic expression; or, at best, considered the two to be intimately connected as cause and effect. The moral degeneracy of the Italians fully explained to him the faults in their music. "It would indeed be marvellous," he said, "if any music could exist where there is no solid principle." He had a musical conscience; and he confessed, "I take music in a very serious light, and I consider it quite inadmissible to compose any thing that I do not thoroughly feel. It is just as if I were to utter a falsehood. For notes have as distinct a meaning as words, perhaps even a more definite sense." His ear heard the meaning of musical phrases as clearly as Ruskin's eye reads the character of pillars and porticoes. As Mr. Ruskin finds classical architecture to be "licentious, meretricious, mocking, scoffing, profane, pagan, and diabolical," so Mendelssohn found Auber's music to contain nothing but "braggadocio, degrading sensuality, pedantry, epicurism, and parodies of foreign nationality." Those who were not in earnest about politics and religion, he thought, could not be in earnest about art; and art was a nullity to any one who was not in earnest about it. I cannot fancy Mendelssohn writing slight waltzes for a tea-garden, like Beethoven, or perpetrating such a monstrous imbecility as the Wellington Symphony. Nor can I fancy him, like Handel, laying his contemporaries under contribution, and coolly transcribing other men's compositions into his scores. He had not the consciousness that justified the thefts of Handel and Shakespeare, who appropriated other men's fancies, "as the osprey takes the fish, by sovereignty of nature." I cannot fancy Mendelssohn announcing, as Beethoven did, after

listening to Cherubini's *Requiem*, "I intend to write a requiem, and I shall take that for my model."

Mendelssohn's genius also manifests itself clearly in his sympathies and antipathies. He liked the followers and affecters of artificial genius, but the affected naturalists he could not endure. One of his chief friends at Rome was a pedantic collector of scores, a man who had not much ear for music, or much intelligence for the art, but who knew a great deal of its bibliography. Mendelssohn found him a "quiet, zealous collector," sometimes fatiguing, sometimes irritable; but a man who adopted and persevered in one pursuit, prosecuting it to the best of his ability, and endeavouring to perfect it for the benefit of mankind. Such people Mendelssohn loved and esteemed. But he hated the young artists of the *Café Greco*, smoking in their den, with slouched hats over their eyes, and huge mastiffs swarming with vermin beside them, without coats or neck-ties, saying rude things to each other, hiding their eyes behind spectacles, sipping coffee, and speaking with the most irreverent familiarity of Titian and Pordenone. These "infernal critics" are Mendelssohn's blackest beasts, whom he vows and swears to annihilate, so far as harsh and cutting words will do it. Not that I suppose even a natural genius would find much satisfaction in the company of these caricatures of naturalists. Still the men which such a genius attracts, and among whom it finds most sympathy and appreciation, belong more or less to this school; while the men which a genius like Mendelssohn's attracts are of the measured and artificial kind.

As in music I contrast Mendelssohn with the great unconscious creators—Handel, Mozart, Beethoven,—so in poetry I should contrast Milton with Shakespeare, Wordsworth with Byron, Virgil with Homer, as the respective models of natural and artificial, unconscious and conscious art. In natural philosophy I find the same contrast between Galileo and Copernicus. The two men were equally convinced of the truth of the Heliocentric system. Yet of this truth one was utterly careless, equally ready to affirm or deny it, as if it signified no more than wearing a beard, or dressing in a particular colour; as if it was of no more importance than a particular sequence of chords might be to a composer, or a particular effect of light and shade to a painter. Copernicus, on the other hand, looked upon his discovery in a more serious light. He concealed it for years, for fear of the contradictions it would have to encounter; and when at last he published it, it was with a preface,

which declared that no authority upon earth should make him renounce it. If perchance, he said, some babbler, setting himself up as a judge of mathematics, about which he knows nothing, but grounding himself upon some distorted text of Scripture, dares to condemn my work, I have not a word to say to him, so long as I am allowed to despise his censure as rash. Mathematics must be left to mathematicians. For Copernicus there were inferior orders of truth which might be concealed, but there were no orders of truth which might be denied in the interests of a higher truth. Some were necessary, others unnecessary to be known; but, once known, all were equal as truths. Science became as much matter of conscience as religion. The least truth could not be sacrificed to the greatest. Both had their rights, and it was better to die than to betray them. But for Galileo the case was very different. Life and the solid aims of life were one thing, the mere ornaments of life were another. Scientific truth was but a matter of taste, not for a moment to be brought into competition with the real or supposed interests of religion, politics, or domestic economy. It has been said that there were two Galileos; one the unconscious genius hurried on by the uncontrollable impulses of his inspiration, and the other the subtle, pliant courtier, the sensual lover of ease, and sociable conventionalist. It might as wisely be said that there were two Shakespeares—one the poet, the other the man of the world. I don't mean to say that Galileo's was a perfect character; but I maintain that it was consistent, that its unity is perfectly intelligible, and that he was by no means so base a coward as M. Chasles has chosen to paint him. Galileo had not that consciousness of the personality of genius which alone gives a man an idea of his dignity as an artist or discoverer. His discoveries were his amusement, not his end. Newton thought the value of his scientific investigations was far below that of his inquiries into prophecy. Galileo did not for a moment allow his theories to come into competition with his religion. M. Chasles wonders why Galileo did not fly to Venice, and call upon all Europe to support him in his conflict with the theologians. He forgets that this would have made Galileo inconsistent,—would have shown that science was the ultimate aim and object of his life, instead of a mere accidental adjunct and ornament, which grew out of him like the hair from his head; so that he could with equal grace submit the one to the barber's razor, and the other to the shears of the Barberini.

Galileo, instead of being an unprincipled coward, as M. Chasles tries to make him out to be, in order by the contrast to show how much more unprincipled his ecclesiastical enemies were, seems to me to have acted on principle throughout. Thus his example becomes a significant lesson to faithful Christians who are also philosophers, when their philosophy crosses the supposed interests of the Church, and incurs the censure of theologians. Certain of their faith, in a different order of certainty and intimate conviction from that in which they are certain of their scientific theories, they cannot for a moment think of resigning their faith to their science, but determine to sacrifice the latter when the two come into competition. And so they continue till in the order of sense they find the power of the will to be null in presence of that of the intellect, and that the *e pur si muove* must always lie hidden behind the most determined resolution to say that the earth does not move. "I am determined," Galileo may have said, "to keep my faith intact. If the faith teaches that the earth stands still, and the sun moves, then there is some sense in which they do so. Authority does not give understanding; our understanding must find the way of reconciling what authority tells with the postulates of reason. I can believe that the earth is founded and stands for ever on its bases without denying it all motion; I can say that the sun is the centre of our system without making it entirely fixed. Thus, taken absolutely, I can say that the Copernican system is false; but this does not prevent me from saying that the Ptolemaic system is much more false. There is some defect in the Copernican system which prevents its being absolutely true. There is a radical subversion of truth in that of Ptolemy which makes it absurd." In some such way Galileo could remain for sixteen years contented under the definition of the Congregation of the Index in 1616, and could bring himself to recant his opinions in 1632.

The whole transaction is most painful; and M. Chasles has made it more so by his treating it as a mere personal question of envy, hatred, and malice on one side, and pliant cowardice on the other. It was, on the contrary, a question, on one side, of the apparent interests of Christendom, and, on the other, of submission to authority in matters over which that authority had no jurisdiction, in order not to break with it in those matters over which it was the rightful judge. The question was one of terrible difficulties on both sides; and before those difficulties can be made to render up all the doctrine which they involve, they must be

studied in a spirit very different from that of M. Philarète Chasles.

Almost every event of this magnitude has its comic side, and its buffoons. The chief buffoons of Galileo's controversy were a Dominican friar, who preached upon the sun's standing still at Joshua's bidding, and began his sermon, "*Viri Galilæi, quid statis aspicientes in cælum?*" and a certain Father Inchofer, whose holy indignation led him to take a curious view of Galileo's "errors" in relation to Christian dogma. In his *tractatus syllepticus* he maintains that "the movement of the earth is of all heresies the most abominable, the most pernicious, the most scandalous; that a man had better bring forward in the lecture room, in societies, in public discussions, and in printed books, all the arguments against the principal articles of faith, against the immortality of the soul, against the creation and incarnation, than against the dogma of the stability of the earth; that this article of faith is so præeminently sacred that no disputes can be allowed concerning it, were they even only for the purpose of proving its falsity."

In all periods when opinions in themselves harmless and true are mixed up with ecclesiastical interests in such a manner as to become the watchwords of parties, and badges of agreement or disagreement with authorities, there are always weak-minded people who elevate these opinions to a sphere where they have no place, who make them dogmas of faith or heretical paradoxes, and who, to save themselves the trouble of judgment and discrimination, would rather see a man fall into known heresy or into open sin than see him embrace an opinion of which they know not whether it is true or false, but only know that it is rejected by the ecclesiastical party to which they belong. Christians like Galileo would be far less tempted to misbelief if they were not tempted by such unwise defenders of the faith. But not even these could make him go astray. They might compel him to renounce an opinion which he still held to be true, but they could never make him belie his profession. "No man in the world can call in question my exemplary piety, and my blind obedience to the commands of holy Church."

If Galileo had been a genius of the second kind, with a dominant idea of the dignity of genius, and a conscience in matters of science, he might have avoided all collision with authority by his silence; but he could scarcely have escaped with the same supple agility which the historical Galileo exhibited. I wonder what Mendelssohn would have done, if he had been ordered to record his conviction of the supe-

riority of the Gregorian chant to all later developments of music. At any rate, the absence of earnest devotion to art or science has one convenience. It obviates all chance of one's ever being called on to suffer martyrdom in its cause.

G. P.

EDMUND CAMPION.—No. VIII.

AFTER Hilary Term 1580 was over, Campion and Parsons found London emptied of friends and swarming with spies. Further stay there had become both useless and perilous, and they determined, with the other priests, to go forth on their appointed missions into the shires. Each Jesuit Father was furnished with two horses and a servant, two suits of apparel for travelling, sixty pounds in money, books, vestments, and all needful furniture for the church or for the road, by George Gilbert, who also promised to supply whatever more might be needful for him. Gilbert* was the founder and the soul of the young men's club, the origin of which I described in my last chapter. Not only did their peculiar position force these young laymen into such an association, but the various difficulties of the missionary priests made the coöperation of some such body absolutely necessary. The penal laws were already very severe, and held out strong inducements to the layman to betray the missionaries. Prudence, therefore, forbade them to compromise themselves, or the person whom they visited, before they knew that their visits at his house would be safe to themselves and acceptable to him. It was for this reason that the Jesuits were ordered to be very careful whom they conversed with; to prefer the gentleman, because of his greater influence when converted, his greater power to protect them, as well as the greater unlikelihood of his betraying their secret. But the Jesuits were on no account to have any personal dealings with the Protestant till his Catholic friends had sounded his disposition, secured his impartiality, and ascertained that the priests might speak with him without fear of being betrayed.† And all this required an extensive organisation among the Catholic gentry.

Further, as the safety of the priests required that they should know to whom they were going to trust themselves,

* Matthew Tanner, *Apost. S.J.*, p. 180.

† Instructions given to the first Jesuits sent on the English mission, art. xi.; Archives du Royaume, Brussels; Inventaire des Archives du Province des Jésuites, no. 1085.¹

and should be protected and conducted on their way from house to house, so did the safety of their host require that he should know whom he was receiving. Missionaries could not carry about with them the certificates of their priesthood, still less the proofs of their honesty. Unknown strangers might be spies or false brothers, or fallen priests, as easily as honest men. It was necessary, then, that missionaries should be conducted by some well-known and trustworthy person, who could answer for their identity and their honesty at the houses where they were introduced. Hence this conductor had to be a gentleman well known and respected throughout the country.

The members of the association bound themselves to perform the two functions of preparing Protestants and conducting the priests, and besides to procure alms for the common fund, out of which the priests were supplied. Their promise entailed upon them great sacrifices; they determined "to imitate the lives of apostles, and devote themselves wholly to the salvation of souls and conversion of heretics." They promised "to content themselves with food and clothing and the bare necessities of their state, and to bestow all the rest for the good of the Catholic cause." And their association was solemnly blessed by Gregory XIII., April 14, 1580.* These men soon became known as "subseminaries;" "conductors, companions, and comforters of priests;" "lay brothers;" out of whom the Jesuits were accused of getting "either all or most part of their riches," before turning them into their officers and solicitors; "inferior agents," "lay assistants," to "straggle abroad and bring in game," whose business it was, "not to argue, but to pry in corners, to get men to entertain conference of the priest, or inveigle youths to fly over sea to the seminaries."†

The association, as we may imagine, consisted "of young gentlemen of great zeal and forwardness in religion;" men of birth and property, without wives or office, and thus free to devote themselves to the cause. They entered on their dangerous and difficult path with "extraordinary joy and alacrity, every man offering himself, his person, his ability, his friends, and whatever God had lent him besides." Gilbert was the first; others were, Henry Vaux, Campion's old pupil; and Vaux's brother-in-law, Brooks; Charles Arun-

* Faculties granted to Parsons and Campion, State-Paper Office, Dom. Eliz., vol. cxxxvii., nos. 26-28.

† Watson, Quodlibets, pp. 89 and 113; John Gee, Foot out of the Snare, p. 66.

del ; Charles Basset, great-grandson of Sir Thomas More ; Edward and Francis Throgmorton ; William Brooksby ; Richard and William Griffen ; Arthur Creswell ; Edward Fitton ; Stephen Brinkly ; Gervase and Henry Pierrepont ; Nicholas Roscarock ; Anthony Babington ; Chideock Titchbourne ; Charles Tilney ; Edward Abingdon ; Thomas Salisbury ; Jerome Bellamy ; William Tresham ; Thomas Fitzherbert ; John Stonor ; James Hall ; Richard Stanihurst, another of Campion's pupils ; Godfrey Fuljambe, who afterwards did very little credit to the society, and many others whom Parsons will not name for fear of compromising them. Among them must have been, at one time, Lord Oxford, Lord Henry Howard, Mr. Southwell, Lord Paget, and Thomas Pounce. It will be seen by the above list that the young men not only belonged to the chief Catholic families of the land, but that the society also furnished the principals of many of the real or pretended plots of the last twenty years of Elizabeth and the first few years of James I. So difficult must it ever be to keep a secret organisation long faithful to a purely religious and ecclesiastical purpose.

Equipped by this society, Parsons and Campion rode forth ; the first accompanied by George Gilbert, the second by Gervase Pierrepont. They agreed to meet to take leave of each other at Hogsdon, at the house of a gentleman,—I think, Sir William Catesby,—whose wife, a Throgmorton, was a Catholic. He himself was not yet converted ; and for this reason the true names of his guests were not told to him.

Just before the Jesuits left Hogsdon, there came to them in hot haste Thomas Pounce, who was a prisoner in the Marshalsea, but who had found means to blind the gaoler to his temporary absence. He told them that a meeting of the associates, prisoners and others, had been held at the prison, to discuss the means of counteracting the rumours which the council was encouraging.

It was believed that the Jesuits had come into England for political purposes. The story, said Pounce, would grow during their absence from London, and would gain fresh strength with every fresh report of the conversions which they were about to make in the shires ; the council would be exasperated, and if either of the fathers ever fell into its hands, he would be guilefully put out of the way or openly slaughtered, and then books would be published to deface him, according to the usual fashion of the day ; hereby well-meaning people would be deceived, and the Catholic cause not a little slandered. But much of this, he went on to declare, would be remedied if each of the fathers would

write a brief declaration of the true causes of his coming, and would leave it, properly signed and sealed, with some sure friends until the day he might be taken or put to death. And then, if the enemy should falsely defame him, his friends might publish the declaration to justify his memory before God and man. Hence Pounce begged both of them to write their declarations, as if they were writing their last will.

The proposition seemed to proceed from zeal and mature discretion, and it was accepted by both the fathers. Parsons's paper is still preserved among the Mss. at Stonyhurst. And Campion, says Parsons, being a man of singular good-nature, and easy to be persuaded to whatever religion or piety inclined towards, rose from the company, took a pen, and seated himself at the end of the table, where in less than half an hour he wrote the declaration which was soon to be so famous. It was written without preparation, and in the hurry of starting; yet it was so "pithy in substance and style" that it was a triumph to one party and poison to the other. It was addressed to the Lords of the Council, before whom he expected to be examined when he should be apprehended. It runs thus:

"RIGHT HONOURABLE,—Whereas I have, out of Germany and Boeme-land, being sent by my superiors, adventured myself into this noble realm, my dear country, for the glory of God and benefit of souls, I thought it like enough that, in this busy, watchful, and suspicious world, I should, either sooner or later, be interrupted and stopped of my course. Wherefore, providing for all events, and uncertain what may become of me when God shall haply deliver my body into durance, I supposed it needful to put this writing in a readiness, desiring your good lordships to give it the reading, and to know my cause. This doing, I trust I shall ease you of some labour, for that which otherwise you must have sought by practice of wit, I do now lay into your hands by plain confession. And to the intent this whole matter may be conceived in order, and so the better both understood and remembered, I make thereof these nine points or articles, directly, truly, and resolutely opening my full enterprise and purpose.

1. I confess that I am, albeit unworthy, a priest of the Catholic Church, and, through the great mercies of God, vowed now these eight years into the religion of the Society of Jesus; and thereby have taken upon me a special kind of warfare under the banner of obedience, and eke resigned all my interest and possibility of wealth, honour, pleasures, and other worldly felicities.

2. At the voice of our General Provost, which is to me a warrant from Heaven and an oracle of Christ, I took my voyage from Prague to Rome, where our said General Father is alway resident, and from Rome to England, as I might and would have done joy-

ously into any part of Christendom or Heathenesse, had I been thereto assigned.

3. My charge is, of free cost to preach the Gospel, to minister the sacraments, to instruct the simple, to reform sinners, to confute errors, and, in brief, to cry alarm spiritual against foul vice and proud ignorance, wherewith many my dear countrymen are abused.

4. I never had mind, and am straitly forbid by our fathers that sent me, to deal in any respects with matters of state or policy of this realm, as those things which appertain not to my vocation, and from which I do gladly estrange and sequester my thoughts.

5. I ask, to the glory of God, with all humility, and under your correction, three sorts of indifferent and quiet audience. The first before your honours; wherein I shall discourse of religion so far as it toucheth the commonwealth and your nobilities. The second, whereof I make most account, before the doctors and masters and chosen men of both universities; wherein I undertake to avow the faith of our Catholic Church by proofs invincible, scriptures, councils, fathers, histories, natural and moral reason. The third, before the lawyers spiritual and temporal; wherein I will justify the said faith by the common wisdom of the laws standing yet in force and practice.

6. I would be loth to speak any thing that might sound of an insolent brag or challenge,* especially being now as a dead man to this world, and willing to cast my head under every man's foot, and to kiss the ground he treads upon. Yet have I such a courage in advancing the majesty of Jesus my King, and such affiance in His gracious favour, and such assurance in my quarrel, and my evidence so impregnable, because I know perfectly that none of the Protestants, nor all the Protestants living, nor any sect of our adversaries (howsoever they face men down in pulpits, and overrule us in their kingdom of grammarians and unlearned ears), can maintain their cause in disputation. I am to sue most humbly and instantly for the combat with all and every of them, or with the principal that may be found of them; protesting that in this trial the better furnished they come, the better welcome they shall be to me.

7. And because it hath pleased God to enrich the qucen my sovereign lady with noble gifts of nature, learning, and princely education, I do verily trust, that if her highness would vouchsafe her royal person and good attention to such a conference as in the second part of my fifth article I have mentioned and requested, or to a few sermons which in her or your hearing I am to utter, such a manifest and fair light, by good method and plain dealing, may

* Of course this document, when published, became known by this title; the first reply to it was entitled:

"The great Bragge and Challenge of M. Champion a Jesuite, commonlye called Edmunde Campion, latelye arrived in Englande, contayninge nync articles, here seuerallye laide downe, directed by him to the Lordes of the Counsaile, confuted and aunswered by Meredith Hanmer, M. of Art and Student in Divinitie. Imprinted at London, in Fletstreate, nere unto Sayncte Dunston's Church, by Thomas Marsh. 1581."

be cast upon those controversies, that possibly her zeal of truth and love of her people shall incline her noble grace to disfavour some proceedings hurtful to the realm, and procure towards us oppressed more equity.

8. Moreover, I doubt not but you, her honourable council, being of such wisdom and drift in cases most important, when you shall have heard these questions of religion opened faithfully which many times by our adversaries are huddled up and confounded, will see upon what substantial grounds our Catholic faith is builded, and how feeble that side is which by sway of the time prevaieth against us; and so at last, for your own souls, and for many thousand souls that depend upon your government, will discountenance error when it is bewrayed, and hearken to those which would spend the best blood in their bodies for your salvation. Many innocent hands are lifted up unto heaven for you daily and hourly, by those English students whose posterity shall not die, which, beyond the seas, gathering virtue and sufficient knowledge for the purpose, are determined never to give you over, but either to win you to Heaven or to die upon your pikes. And touching our Society, be it known unto you, that we have made a league—all the Jesuits in the world, whose succession and multitude must overreach all the practices of England—cheerfully to carry the cross that you shall lay upon us, and never to despair your recovery while we have a man left to enjoy your Tyburn, or to be racked with your torments, or to be consumed with your prisons. The expense is reckoned, the enterprise is begun; it is of God, it cannot be withstood. So the faith was planted, so it must be restored.

9. If these my offers be refused, and my endeavours can take no place, and I, having run thousands of miles to do you good, shall be rewarded with rigour,—I have no more to say, but to recommend your case and mine to Almighty God, the Searcher of hearts, who send us of His grace, and set us at accord before the day of payment, to the intent we may at last be friends in heaven, where all injuries shall be forgotten.”

Campion wrote his triple challenge with more confidence in his cause, and more trust in the good-will of his opponents, than knowledge of their views. To reconcile the Catholicism which he came to preach with the designs of the politicians of the council was a task beyond all the powers of reason.

Elizabeth, had she been disposed to tolerate Catholics at all, would only have tolerated them on condition of their abjuring obedience to the Pope in matters which pertained to the state or affected the queen. But Campion could not even deny the validity of the Bull by which the queen was deprived of her crown, and could only show that he and the Catholics were for the present dispensed from attempting to enforce it, and from the penalties of its non-observance. The question of political reconciliation never advanced beyond this knot; and till this

was untied, the very terms of his challenge seemed to absolve his opponents from listening to his arguments upon the two remaining topics. His challenges to the politicians and to the lawyers were calculated to thwart him in his attempts to get a fair hearing from the divines, and were at first sight inconsistent with his profession of not meddling in matters of state. When he came to pen his seventh article, he had already recognised that the second part of his fifth article contained the pith of his challenge, and that the rest was superfluous. But there was no time to remodel it. He wrote it in haste, and gave a copy to Pounce, keeping the original himself. He desired that it might not be published till there was necessity for so doing; but he forgot to seal it, as had been proposed, and as the more wary Parsons took care to do. Pounce, therefore, went back to prison and read it, and was thrown by it into such a dithyrambic state of mind that, though he had no intention of imparting it to his friends, still less of giving them, or allowing them to take, copies of it, he was resolved not to hide its light altogether under a bushel.

The Marshalsea in Southwark, which was one of the chief prisons for recusant Catholics, was at that time infested by two Puritan ministers,—Mr. Tripp and Mr. Crowley,—who, under the protection of the authorities, visited the poorer prisoners in their cells, and urged them to “abide some conference” with them, “offering, like vain men, in angles, to the uncharitable vexation of the poor prisoners,” that disputation which they obstinately refused to abide in public. Pounce then, bursting with the secret of Campion’s challenge, which he carried in his bosom, was inspired by it himself to make a public challenge to Tripp and Crowley, and to back it up (Sept. 8) with petitions to the Council and to the Bishop of London, in which he discovered the universal wish of the Catholics for public conferences, and challenged a discussion, four to four, or six to six, on each side, adding, that he knew two or three who would challenge all the Protestant divines together, and give them Beza and all his brethren in. “Let this petition,” he concluded, “made in the name of all the Catholic fathers of our nation, remain for a perpetual record and testimony, even to our enemies, of our indifference and their insufficiency. Muse not, my lords, at this challenge, with a counterbuff, as the soldier saith, for it is made in the further behalf (as it may be presumed) of a perpetual corporation and succession of most learned fathers, as any without comparison in the world;* with the aid of another good race besides, which cannot die,† who have all vowed, as cha-

* The Jesuits.

† The seminary priests.

rity hath inflamed them, either to win this realm again to the Catholic faith, and that without any bloodshed except their own, at God's permission, or else to die all upon the pikes of your sharpest laws, and win heaven, as they hope, for themselves." Much of this, it will be seen, is copied closely from the eighth article of Campion's declaration.

Parsons had once before found that Campion could not be safely intrusted to the custody of the young associates of the Society,—a set of youths, as Bartoli writes, "*santa invero e degna d'ogni spirituale consolatione, ma per l'età e per lo concepito fervore, più generosa che cauta,*"*—for they were in a state of excitement similar to that which animated the first Crusaders. As gallant and enthusiastic as the conquerors of Jerusalem, they were quite as unable to understand or to obey the rules of political wisdom and prudence. Every earthly consideration seemed to them a presumptuous interference of earth with Heaven. Thus the same zeal which gave them their energies hurried them forward into the paths where those energies would be more mischievous than useful. Instead of letting Heaven dictate their end, and leaving earthly prudence to preside over their choice of the earthly means to their heavenly end, they obliterated all distinctions, and considered ends and means to lie alike within the supernatural sphere; and they were convinced that for every fresh danger that threatened them God had a new miracle in store to deliver them.

Pounde's reckless enthusiasm in challenging the ministers, and petitioning the Bishop and Council, had the effect of convincing the queen's ministers that a conspiracy was on foot. Pounde soon felt the consequences. The Bishop of London removed him (Sept. 18) from his companions in the Marshalsea, and sent him, heavily ironed, to solitary confinement in the then half-ruined episcopal castle at Bishop's Stortford. Pounde therefore, on the eve of his departure, either delivered Campion's paper to the keeping of some one even less retentive of a secret than himself, or else communicated it through an unwillingness to be checkmated by the Bishop of London, whose conduct he regarded as a mere dodge to stop all mention of a public discussion, or from a conviction that Campion's challenge was much more calculated to embarrass the council than his own had proved to be. Actuated by one of these motives, Pounde communicated the paper to his neighbour Titchbourne,† Titchbourne to William Horde, and Horde to several others, and especially to Elizabeth Sanders,

* Inghilterra, p. 107.

† They were both Hampshire men.

a nun, sister to Dr. Sanders, who was at this time with the Italian expedition in Ireland. Upon all these people John Watson, the Bishop of Winchester, laid hands on the 18th of November or thereabouts, committed their bodies to the house of correction at Winchester, confiscated their "lewd and forbidden books," and sent up to the Lords of the Council a copy of the "seditious supplication, protestation, or challenge," which, he added, seemed "very plausible" to the people in his part of England.* About the same time, another copy was discovered and sent up to the council by the Sheriff of Wilts. And from this time it became well known all over England, and many persons got into trouble for circulating copies of it.†

Pounde was right in the importance he attached to public disputation. It soon became one of the chief weapons of the Jesuits, whose unexampled dexterity in wielding it is thus described by a Protestant traveller, Sir Edwin Sandys :‡

"As for the controversies themselves, the main matter of all other, therein their industry is at this day incomparable; having so altered the tenures of them, refined the states, subtilised the distinctions, sharpened their own proofs, devised answers, . . . that in affiance of this furniture, and of their promptness of speech and wit, which by continual exercise they aspire to perfect, they dare enter into combat even with the best of their oppugners; and will not doubt but either to entangle him so in the snares of their own quirks, or at leastwise so to avoid and put off his blows with the manifold wards of their multiplied distinctions, that an ordinary auditor shall never conceive them to be vanquished, and a favourable shall report them vanquishers.

Whereupon they now, to be quit with their adversaries, and by the very same act to draw away the multitude, cry mainly in all places for trial by disputations. This Campion the Jesuit did many years since with us. This, as I passed through Zurich, did the Cardinal Andrea of Constance and his Jesuits with their ministers. . . . Not long before, the same was done at Geneva; and very lately the Capuchins renewed the challenge. In which parts I observed this discreet valour on both sides, that as the Romanists offer to dispute in the adversaries' own cities, which they know their magistrates will never accord, so the ministers, in supply thereof, offer to go to them

* State-Paper Office, Dom. Eliz. vol. cxliv. no. 31. There is a biographical notice of Pounde in the *Rambler* of July and August 1857, vol. xx. pp. 24 and 94. The challenge and petitions of Pounde are in the State-Paper Office, Dom. Eliz. vol. cxlii. no. 20.

† E.g. a number of young Irishmen, or rather English of the Pale, Fitzsimons, Richard Talbot, Walter Sutton, James Luttrell, and John Finglas, were examined on this point in January 1581. Their letters, which make mention of Mr. P. (Patrick, i.e. Campion), may be seen among the Domestic Papers of Feb. 17, 1581, in the State-Paper Office.

‡ Europæ Speculum, p. 94: "Of their offers of disputation."

to their cities, and that now is as much disliked on the other part ; each side being content that the fire should be kindled rather in his enemies' house than in his own."

The council soon knew of Campion's departure from London, and sent pursuivants into most of the shires of England with authority to apprehend him and Parsons wherever they could find them. But the Jesuits were diligently warned by the Catholics, and easily avoided their pursuers.

"They lost their labour" (says Parsons), "and we had three or four months free to follow our business, in which period, by the help and direction of the young gentlemen that went with us, we passed through the most part of the shires of England, preaching and administering the sacraments in almost every gentleman's and nobleman's house that we passed by, whether he was Catholic or not, provided he had any Catholics in his house to hear us.

We entered, for the most part, as acquaintance or kinsfolk of some person that lived within the house, and when that failed us, as passengers or friends of some gentleman that accompanied us ; and after ordinary salutations, we had our lodgings, by procurement of the Catholics, within the house, in some part retired from the rest, where, putting ourselves in priests' apparel and furniture,—which we always carried with us,—we had secret conference with the Catholics that were there, or such of them as might conveniently come, whom we ever caused to be ready for that night late to prepare themselves for the sacrament of confession ; and the next morning, very early, we had Mass, and the Blessed Sacrament ready for such as would communicate, and after that an exhortation ; and then we made ourselves ready to depart again. And this was the manner of proceeding when we stayed least ; but when there was longer and more liberal stay, then these exercises were more frequent."

The government had hitherto contented itself with issuing proclamations,—a second was published against harbouring Jesuits on the 3d of July,—and with searching for the missionaries. But when Pounce's challenge put it upon the false scent of a plot to stir up rebellion by promulgating the Pope's "Bulls and messages," and especially when this false opinion was corroborated by the dispersion of Campion's challenge, very different measures seemed necessary. When we consider the state of England and Ireland at the time, these fears do not seem utterly unreasonable. The measures which they prompted were both energetic and comprehensive. They amounted to a plan for putting all the Catholic gentry of England under surveillance, and for confining all the most energetic of them either to prison or to very narrow limits. First, certain castles in various parts of England were selected for the custody of the recusants, and a keeper and two super-

intendents appointed for each. Wisbeach Castle, which had been already selected in 1572, on account of its solitary site, and as a place where the chief recusants should be imprisoned and made "to live at their own charges,"* was now made the prison for such of "the capital doctors and priests" as were found "busier in matters of state than was meet for the quiet of the realm."† Sir Nicholas Bacon was appointed keeper; and Michell and Carleton, the latter a sour Puritan, were to be the resident superintendents.‡ Banbury was apportioned for the recusants of Warwick, Oxford, and Northampton; Tremingham for those of Norfolk and Suffolk; Kimbolton for those of Huntingdon, Buckingham, and Bedford; Portchester for those of Surrey, Hants, and Sussex; Devizes for those of Dorset, Wilts, and Somerset; Melbourne for Stafford, Derby, Leicester, Lincoln, and Nottingham; Halton in Cheshire, for Lancashire, Cheshire, and North Wales; Wigmore, in Montgomeryshire, for Hereford, Monmouth, Worcester, and South Wales. Those proposed for the north were, Middleham, Knaresborough, Durham, and Barnard Castle. The instructions to the keeper of Wisbeach Castle§ will serve as a specimen of the rest. Besides the usual rules of close confinement, a minister was to be appointed, to have "his charge of diet and other necessities by the contributions of the recusants;" and the keeper was to see "that due exercise of common prayer be observed every day, and preaching twice in the week at least." At this the prisoners were to be present, or, if they refused, they were to be fined at the pleasure of the Bishop of Ely. Each prisoner, moreover, was to be, "twice in the week at least, conferred with, as well by the minister as by other learned men sent by the bishop, or that voluntarily of themselves should come for so charitable a work." But the prisoners were to have no conference with each other but at meal-time, and then there was to be "no speech of any matters in controversy." Those who conferred with the minister were to have more liberty than those who did not. But none were to be allowed to have any books except a Bible, the works of the Fathers, and books licensed by the minister.

To this place, to this discipline, the government banished Watson, the Bishop of Lincoln; Feckenham, the Abbot of Westminster; and other dignitaries,—who up to this time had been allowed a certain amount of liberty.

* Letter of Council to Cox, Bishop of Ely, March 1572; Kennett's Collection, vol. xlviii.; Lansdowne Mss. no. 982, fol. 6.

† Burghley's Execution of Justice, p. 11 (reprint of 1675).

‡ Harleian Mss., no. 360, fol. 65.

§ Ibid. fol. 5.

"In their old age" (writes a priest from London to Father Agazari, rector of the English College at Rome*) "they are sent to Wisbeach Castle, a most unhealthy place, under the orders of a sour Puritan. It is certain they cannot live long there. Over and above the miseries of imprisonment, they are shamefully treated by their keeper. All books but a single Bible are taken from them, nor are they allowed any papers of their own writings, or notes. Conceited ministers are let in upon them without warning, with whom they must argue without preparation, or endure their insults. The most false and ridiculous libels upon them are published, and even printed, in order to lessen the consideration in which they are held. Last month† an immodest woman was shut up without their knowledge in one of their chambers, to give a handle for a false charge of incontinence. No access is allowed, and we are obliged to use tricks to communicate with them. When any one wants to give them an alms, he walks in the neighbouring fields the day before, and cries out as if he was looking for game. At this sign, one of them looks out of window, and learns by signal that there is something for the prisoners. The next night, when every body is asleep, the sportsman cautiously creeps up to the wall, and one of the prisoners lets down a basket from the window whence the sign was given, and draws up what is put into it. The same plan is generally adopted for the other prisons; but the variety of places requires a variety of methods, and the zeal, charity, and bravery of the Catholics is greatly conspicuous in designing and accomplishing these dangerous services."

After the coast had been somewhat cleared by confining the "capital doctors and priests" in Wisbeach, and the other recusants, already committed, in the other castles, the council undertook a general raid against all the Catholics of England. The chief of them were sent for to London, to answer before the council. Letters were directed to the Bishops to summon and commit those who were not summoned to London; but they were told to be careful not to permit them "to come many together at a time," for fear they should know their strength.‡ Those who appeared in London had first to give bonds for their appearance, and were then committed, some as prisoners to their own houses, some to those of their Protestant friends, and others to the castles prepared for them.

Father Parsons quotes a long string of names of persons committed. The following were the chief of them. The Earl of Southampton, Lord Herbert, Lord Compton, Lord Paget, Sir Thomas Fitzherbert, Sir John Arundell, Sir Alex-

* Transcribed in Sanders, *De Schismate*, lib. iii.

† This letter is dated July 1581.

‡ Harleian Mss., no. 360, fol. 65.

ander Culpeper, Sir John Southworth, Sir Nicholas Poyntz, Sir Thomas Gerard, Sir George Peckham, John Talbot of Grafton, William and Richard Shelly, Ralph Sheldon, Thomas and Francis Throgmorton, John and Edward Gage, Nicholas Thimbleby, William and Robert Tirwhit, Richard Culpeper, John Walker, Mr. Towneley, Mr. Guilford, Robert Price, Peter Titchbourne, Erasmus Wolseley, John Gifford, Brian Fowler, Thomas Cross.* Both of these events, the proclamation and the persecution, were described by Dr. Allen, who wrote as follows to the Cardinal of Como from Rheims, Sept. 12 (N.S.), 1580 :†

“ MOST ILLUSTRIOUS AND REVEREND LORD CARDINAL,—Not long ago I sent your eminence the late proclamation of the Queen of England against the Catholics of her dominions; not, indeed, professedly against their religion, but against their suspected treason and conspiracy with the refugees. In it she tells her subjects, that the Pope and the King of Spain had been long and earnestly entreated by her enemies and the refugees to make war against her; she boasts that she is quite prepared for it, and that she fears no foreign forces; she commands her subjects to stand fast in their duty and fidelity; and she says she fears neither rebels within, nor the land or sea forces made ready without. Moreover, she declares that in future she means to deal more sharply than her habit or her nature inclines her with those of her subjects who are guilty of any conspiracy with the refugee rebels. Soon after the publication of this edict, by crier, through the whole realm, she orders that in each county all the more powerful and notable Catholics should be apprehended, and committed either to prison or to the custody of heretics. This was immediately, almost suddenly, put in execution; at the same time the strictest search was made for priests, particularly for two lawyers whom we sent over this summer, and for the Jesuits. But the Catholics take such pains, and use such care in concealing them, that up to this time very few have fallen into the enemies' hands. They have only taken two priests of Rheims and one of Rome.

The number of gentlemen now in prison is so great that they are obliged to remove the old prisoners for religion—the Bishop of Lincoln and several other ecclesiastics—to other strong places far distant from the city, to make room for the new prisoners. The same thing had already been done at York. But many think that the reason of this was, that the priests kept prisoners in those cities were converting all the chief citizens and many of the nobility, and persuading them by their life and example to persevere. Those

* This list I have compiled from Parsons, and from an official list of prisoners, Harleian Mss., no. 360, art. 1. Several of the persons named by Parsons, such as Lord Vaux, Sir Thomas Tresham, Sir William Catesby, and Sir Robert Dymock, the champion, were committed at a later date. The two latter were not yet Catholics in July 1580.

† Theiner, *Annales*, vol. iii. p. 215.

gentlemen are treated most severely who are known to have sons in the seminary of Rome or of Rheims. This persecution is heavier, and extends to more persons, than any of those before it. For before this they never committed any of the nobility ; who, however, are not in prison, but only given into the custody of heretics.

It is supposed that they do all this to prevent any Catholics joining the enemy, if there is to be any ; for they are horribly afraid of what is to be. And perhaps they have made quite sure of those whom they have shut up, whatever turns up. But as for the rest, who escape the present danger by dissimulation or other shifts, they are rather provoked and irritated to make some attempt, when God gives opportunity, not only to deliver their own souls, but their friends' also, who are so unhandsomely imprisoned.

And certainly the whole Catholic population, afflicted in soul and body by this disgraceful tyranny of one woman, beseeches God with unspeakable yearnings to grant some redemption. For this we exiles cry out to our most holy Father, the highest minister of justice upon earth ; for this the prisoners groan to him ; for this innumerable afflicted souls, his own sheep, stretch forth their hands to him. Not that we doubt that the well-known compassion of the most holy Gregory can do more than it does ; or that he, our only father upon earth, can wish us better or greater things than he does ; but that we may at least somewhat relieve our most just sorrow for our people by communicating our calamities to our most holy Lord and loving Father, and to your kindness. Certainly, all thinking men prognosticate that this new cruelty will do hurt to our enemies. Whether they intend to do more than imprison is as yet uncertain ; further measures are expected after the meeting of Parliament, which is supposed to be soon about to take place. Our religion is only exalted above its condemners by this persecution, and by the admirable constancy which it calls forth. And it is made clear to all, that the question now is not about religion,—of which our enemies have not a bit,—but about the stability of the empire, and about worldly prosperity. May the Lord Jesus long preserve your lordship to be our great defence !

Your Eminence's most humble servant in the Lord,

WILLIAM ALLEN.

Rheims, 12 Sept. 1580.

P.S.—I have sent you a page of the English Calendar, that you may see how solemnly the festival of Elizabeth's birthday is kept on the 7th of September, so as totally to eclipse that of the Blessed Virgin on the 8th, which is omitted. See the pride of the queen, who is not content with the festival of her coronation, but must have her birthday kept besides."

Neither Parsons nor Campion, who were on the spot, describe this persecution with so much bitterness as Dr. Allen at Rheims. This was partly through a generosity of character, to which it is more painful to see others suffer

than to suffer oneself; partly through a consciousness, which Allen could not but have felt, that the persecution was in some measure to be attributed to himself and the foreign moddlers who were perpetually interfering in the political affairs of England, with the object of restoring religion there. In spite of the laboured attempts of Parsons to prove the contrary, it is abundantly clear that Allen was deeply implicated in the plots of the day. The last part of the foregoing letter would have been treasonable in the eyes of all lawyers, especially when we connect his passionate appeal to the Pope with the Papal expedition against Elizabeth which at the very time had descended upon the coast of Ireland, and about which the nuncio at Paris had just sent off this news to Rome: "The Earl of Desmond, and Dr. Nicholas Sanders, and all the Catholic army, are still encamped in their old place—a strong position. They were, at the date of my advice, waiting for foreign aid, without which they can do little or nothing. But we heard yesterday by letter and authentic report that five great ships full of soldiers and munitions of war—sent, it said, by the Holy See—reached in safety some port in Ireland a few days ago."*

The Jesuits were satisfied with the fruits of this first expedition. They found the country people more inclined to be Catholics than the inhabitants of the towns,—“the infection of ministers bore most rule with artisans and merchants;” but the best part of the nobility and gentry, who dwelt on their estates, together with their tenants and dependents, remembered the virtuous life and just proceeding of those of the ancient religion, especially when they saw and felt the present contrast. It was a comfortable thing, says Parsons, to see the universal inclination of so infinite a people to the Catholic religion; but an incredible sorrow to witness the rents and breaches, the wrenches and disjunctures, which the preaching of new doctrines for twenty years had made in the consciences and belief of that good people, which had lived so many ages in one faith. The breach between the Protestants and Puritans was already of many years’ date. But this year Puritanism had given birth to a new development, that of the “Family of Love,” which had already gained several of the queen’s household, and especially of her guard, and against which she published a proclamation, dated Richmond, October 3, in this year. The peasant

* Theiner, *Ann.* iii. 217: “News from Ireland,” early in August 1580. The letter goes on to describe the terror of the English Jezebel and her court of heretics, and the measures of precaution she was adopting.

mind had already begun to ferment. In May, Hammond, the plough-wright of Hethersett, had suffered the loss of his ears for blaspheming the queen and council, and was afterwards burnt in the castle-ditch at Norwich, for saying that the New Testament was a fable; that Christ's blood is not necessary for salvation; that He neither rose again nor ascended into heaven; that there is no Holy Ghost; and that there are no sacraments. Parsons maintains that this denial of all Christianity was a logical development of the principle which renounced the authority of tradition to determine the canon of Scripture and explain its meaning; rejected all merit in order to amplify God's mercy; denied Christ's descent into hell, and the assistance of general councils by the Holy Ghost; and prepared the way for rejecting all the sacraments by rejecting five of them.

But where the fermentation did not drive men into these sloughs, it led them to repair to the Jesuits to be resolved of their doubts and scruples. For, besides the open and obstinate heretics, there were many who were only verging to that state, unable by themselves to solve the arguments of the minister, but easily kept right by the priest. Parsons gives several examples. Anne Dimocke, a maid of honour to the queen, a great follower of the court preachers, had learnt from them that there was no hell, "but only a certain remorse of conscience for him that did evil, which was to be understood for hell, and that all the rest were but bugbears to fright children." To solve this doubt, she applied to Father Parsons, under whose instructions she at once became Catholic, and afterwards left the court and the world, and, with one of Lord Vaux's daughters, followed Parsons to Rouen, where she entered a convent.

Sir Robert Dimocke was another great hearer of sermons, and had been led into such a maze by them, that he had come to doubt whether there was any God. His friends therefore procured a secret interview between him and Father Parsons; and the first point which had to be discussed between them was the existence of God. Parsons, during a ride of a few hours, convinced him on this point; but as Sir Robert was still a Protestant, the father did not dare trust himself with him in any town or house. However, Dimocke afterwards sent for Campion, who finished his conversion, and took him into the Church.

These examples Parsons gives to show how those farthest gone out of order were reduced; how those who were going were stayed; how doubters were resolved; how the cold and negligent were warmed; how those whose good desires were

paralysed by fear were put in heart ; and how those who were good were confirmed.

The venture prospered,—to use the mercantile phraseology they affected in order to conceal their meaning from the uninitiated ; though many slighted their wares, and many defamed them, there were no few buyers and more admirers. Among the Protestants there was vast talk about the Jesuits, who were as much befabled as mythological monsters. There were tales, no more consistent than dreams, current about their origin, their life, their rule, morals, doctrine, designs, and actions. Almost all agreed, however, that they were spies of the Pope, or agents of treason and sedition.

The general tenor of the conduct of the Catholics who received the Jesuits gladly may be learned from the letter to Father Agazzari already quoted : “ When a priest comes to their houses, they first salute him as a stranger unknown to them, and then they take him to an inner chamber where an oratory is set up, where all fall on their knees, and beg his blessing. Then they ask how long he will remain with them, and pray him to stop as long as he may. If he says he must go on the morrow, as he usually does,—for it is dangerous to stay longer,—they all prepare for confession that evening ; the next morning they hear Mass and receive Holy Communion ; then, after preaching and giving his blessing a second time, the priest departs, and is conducted on his journey by one of the young gentlemen.”

The hiding holes had become known, by means of searchers and false brethren, by the middle of 1581 ; so that even thus early the Catholics were compelled, when there was a night alarm, to betake themselves to woods and thickets, to ditches and holes. “ Sometimes when we are sitting merrily at table, conversing familiarly on matters of faith and devotion (for our talk is generally of such things), there comes a hurried knock at the door, like that of a pursuivant ; all start up and listen,—like deer when they hear the huntsmen ; they leave their food, and commend themselves to God in a brief ejaculation ; nor is word or sound heard till the servants come to say what the matter is. If it is nothing, they laugh at their fright.”

“ No one is to be found in these parts who complains of the length of services : if a Mass does not last nearly an hour, many are discontented. If six, eight, or more Masses are said in the same place, and on the same day (as often happens when there is a meeting of priests), the same congregation will assist at all. When they can get priests, they confess

every week. Quarrels are scarce known amongst them. Disputes are almost always left to the arbitration of the priest. They do not willingly intermarry with heretics, nor will they pray with them, nor do they like to have any dealings with them. A lady was lately told that she should be let out of prison, if she would once walk through a church ; she refused. She had come into prison with a sound conscience, and she would depart with it, or die. In Henry's days, the father of this Elizabeth, the whole kingdom, with all its Bishops and learned men, abjured their faith at one word of the tyrant. But now, in his daughter's days, boys and women boldly profess the faith before the judge, and refuse to make the slightest concession even at the threat of death."

In October, when Michaelmas term began, Campion and Parsons returned towards London to meet and confer once more, and to compare the results of their labours. The two letters in which they give an account of their doings will fitly conclude this chapter.

"The heat of the persecution now raging against Catholics throughout the whole realm is most fiery, such as has never been heard of since the conversion of England. Gentle and simple, men and women, are being every where haled to prison, even children are being put into irons ; they are despoiled of their goods, shut out from the light of day, and publicly held up to the contempt of the people in proclamations, sermons, and conferences, as traitors and rebels. It is supposed that the reasons of this great persecution are, first, the ill-success of the English in Ireland ; next, the demonstration made last summer against England by the Spanish fleet ; and lastly, the coming of the Jesuits into the island, and the great number of conversions made by them, which has so astonished the heretics that they know not what to do or say. They are most troubled about a certain protestation of their faith and religion, and of the reasons of their coming into England, which they wrote and signed with their names, and placed in the hands of a friend, for fear that, if they were cast into prison, the heretics might pretend, as is their usual custom, that they had recanted. This protestation was communicated by the man who had charge of it to another, and by him to a third, and it soon came into the hands of an immense number, and even of the queen's councillors.

We hear that one month since more than fifty thousand names of persons who refused to go to the heretical churches were reported. Many more, I fancy, have been discovered since.

The heretics, when they throw the Catholics into prison, only ask them one thing,—to come to their churches, and to hear sermon and service. It was even lately proposed to certain noblemen to come, if it were only once a year, to church, making, if they pleased, a previous protestation that they came not to approve of

their religion or doctrines, but only to show an outward obedience to the queen; and yet all most constantly refused. A certain noble lady was offered her choice, either to stay in prison, or simply to walk through the church without stopping there, or exhibiting any signs of respect; but she declared that she never would. A boy, of, I believe, twelve years, who had been bamboozled by his friends into walking to church before a bride (as the custom here is), and had been afterwards blamed by his companions, was perfectly inconsolable till he found me a few days after, when he threw himself down at my feet, and confessed his sin. A thousand similar instances might be given.

We, although all conversation with us is forbidden by proclamation, are yet most earnestly invited every where; many take long journeys only to speak to us, and put themselves and their fortunes entirely in our hands. It is therefore absolutely necessary that more of our Society should be sent, if possible—not fewer than five: one Spaniard, one Italian, and three Englishman, who must be very learned men, on account of the many entangled cases of conscience, which arises from no one here having ample faculties, and from the difficulty of consulting the Holy See, which is treason.

There is immense want of a Bishop to consecrate for us the holy oils for baptism and extreme unction, for want of which we are brought to the greatest straits; and unless his Holiness makes haste to help us in this matter, we shall be soon at our wits' end.

The adversaries are very mad that by no cruelty can they move a single Catholic from his resolution, no, not even a little girl. A young lady of sixteen was questioned by the sham Bishop of London about the Pope, and answered him with courage, and even made fun of him in public, and so was ordered to be carried to the public prison for prostitutes.* On the way she cried out that she was sent to that place for her religion, and not for immodesty.

A certain English gentleman-pirate lately returned with a booty of more than two millions, taken in the West Indies. The Spanish ambassador reclaimed the spoil in the king's name; but the queen gave the shuffling answer, that the King of Spain had given harbour to the Pope's ships on their passage to Ireland. She asked, moreover, why the Pope, without being harmed, attacked her kingdom in this way. He answered, that he rather wondered that the Pope did not attempt to do more against her, who had treated him so abominably, not only in refusing him all his ecclesiastical rights, which from the most ancient times were allowed to the Holy See by the kings of England, but also by libels, sermons, lewd pictures, and many other ways, by which his authority was defamed and brought into contempt. He said more to the same effect, and the queen was silent then; but afterwards said to a nobleman that the Pope had written to her that he was prepared to approve the whole Protestant service, if she would restore him his

* Bridewell.

title of supreme head of the Church. But in these parts there is often talk of this kind of pretended letters.

I keep myself safe here in London by frequent change of place ; I never remain more than two days in one spot, because of the strict searches made for me. I am quite overwhelmed with business, to which I am obliged to devote the whole day, from early morning till midnight, after I have said Mass and office, and preached, sometimes twice in the day. Therefore I hope for reinforcements, both from our Society and from the Pope's college.

All Catholics here lift up their hands and thank God and his Holiness for founding such a college at Rome, beyond all their hopes ; and they beseech his Holiness, by the bowels of the mercy of our Saviour, to defend the college, and to enlarge it for the needs of the present time.

Two days ago a priest called Clifton was led in chains through the streets, and he walked with so cheerful a countenance that the people wondered. When he saw this, he began to laugh heartily, at which the folks were still more struck, and asked him why he was the only one to laugh at his own sad case, for which every body else pitied him. He answered, it was because he was the gainer in the business. In the beginning of this persecution, there were some people in a certain county who were frightened, and promised to go the Protestant church ; but their wives stood out against them, and threatened to leave them if they, for human respect, left off their obedience to God and the Church. Many like things have taken place among boys, who for this cause have separated themselves from their parents.”*

Campion's letter describes the passages of his career since he last wrote from St. Omers. The events to which the first paragraph refers have already been related ; but it will do no harm to repeat them in his own words. The rest refers to his experience during his first journey through England.

“Having now passed, by God's great mercy, five months in these places, I thought it good to give you intelligence by my letters of the present state of things here, and what we may of likelihood look for to come ; for I am sure, both for the common care of us all, and special love to me, you long to know what I do, what hope I have, how I proceed. Of other things that fell before, I wrote from St. Omers ; what has sithence happened, now I will briefly recount unto you. It fell out, as I construe it, by God's special providence, that, tarrying for wind four days together, I should at length take sea the fifth day in the evening, which was the feast of St. John Baptist, my particular patron, to whom I had often before commended my cause and journey. So we arrived safely at Dover

* Theiner, vol. iii. p. 216 : “Robert Parsons, from London, 17th September 1580.” Theiner has mistaken the date. It should be October, as Parsons was not in London in September. Bartoli quotes it as written November 17th.

the morrow following, very early, my little man and I together. There we were at the very point to be taken, being by commandment brought before the mayor of the town, who conjectured many things,—suspected us to be such as indeed we were, adversaries of the new heretical faction, favourers of the old fathers' faith, that we dissembled our names, had been abroad for religion, and returned again to spread the same. One thing he specially urged, that I was Dr. Allen; which I denied, proffering my oath, if need were, for the verifying thereof. At length he resolveth, and that it so should be, he often repeated, that, with some to guard me, I should be sent to the council. Neither can I tell who altered his determination, saving God, to whom underhand I then humbly prayed, using St. John's intercession also, by whose happy help I safely came so far. Suddenly cometh forth an old man,—God give him grace for his labour!—'Well,' quoth he, 'it is agreed you shall be dismissed; fare you well.' And so we to go apace. The which thing considered, and the like that daily befall unto me, I am verily persuaded that one day I shall be apprehended, but that when it shall most pertain to God's glory, and not before.

Well, I came to London, and my good angel guided me into the same house that had harboured Father Robert [Parsons] before, whither young gentlemen came to me on every hand. They embrace me, reapparel me, furnish me, weapon me, and convey me out of the city. I ride about some picce of the country every day. The harvest is wonderful great. On horseback I meditate my sermon; when I come to the house I polish it. Then I talk with such as come to speak with me, or hear their confessions. In the morning, after Mass, I preach; they hear with exceeding greediness, and very often receive the sacrament, for the ministration whereof we are ever well assisted by priests, whom we find in every place, whereby both the people is well served, and we much eased in our charge. The priests of our country themselves being most excellent for virtue and learning, yet have raised so great an opinion of our Society, that I dare scarcely touch the exceeding reverence all Catholics do unto us. How much more is it requisite that such as hereafter are to be sent for supply, whereof we have great need, be such as may answer all men's expectation of them! Specially let them be well trained for the pulpit. I cannot long escape the hands of the heretics; the enemies have so many eyes, so many tongues, so many scouts and crafts. I am in apparel to myself very ridiculous; I often change it, and my name also. I read letters sometimes myself that in the first front tell news that Campion is taken, which, noised in every place where I come, so filleth my ears with the sound thereof, that fear itself hath taken away all fear. My soul is in mine own hands ever. Let such as you send for supply premeditate and make count of this always. Marry, the solaces that are ever intermingled with these miseries are so great, that they do not only countervail the fear of what punishment temporal soever, but by infinite sweetness make all worldly pains, be they never so great, seem nothing. A con-

science pure, a courage invincible, zeal incredible, a work so worthy the number innumerable, of high degree, of mean calling, of the inferior sort, of every age and sex.

Here, even amongst the Protestants themselves that are of milder nature, it is turned into a proverb, that he must be a Catholic that payeth faithfully what he oweth, insomuch that if any Catholic do injury, every body expostulateth with him as for an act unworthy of men of that calling. To be short, heresy heareth ill of all men ; neither is there any condition of people commonly counted more vile and impure than their ministers, and we worthily have indignation that fellows so unlearned, so evil, so derided, so base, should in so desperate a quarrel overrule such a number of noble wits as our realm hath. Threatening edicts come forth against us daily ; notwithstanding, by good heed, and the prayers of good men, and, which is the chief of all, God's special gift, we have passed safely through the most part of the island. I find many neglecting their own security to have only care of my safety.

A certain matter fell out these days unlooked for. I had set down in writing by several articles the causes of my coming in, and made certain demands most reasonable. I professed myself to be a priest of the Society ; that I returned to enlarge the Catholic faith, to teach the Gospel, to minister the sacraments, humbly asking audience of the queen and the nobility of the realm, and proffering disputations to the adversaries. One copy of this writing I determined to keep with me, that if I should fall into the officers' hands, it might go with me ; another copy I laid in a friend's hand, that when myself with the other should be seized, another might thereupon straight be dispersed. But my said friend kept it not close long, but divulged it, and it was read greedily ; whereat the adversaries were mad, answering out of the pulpit, that themselves certesse would not refuse to dispute, but the queen's pleasure was not that matters should be called in question being already established. In the mean while they tear and sting us with their venomous tongues, calling us seditious, hypocrites, yea heretics too, which is much laughed at. The people hereupon is ours, and that error of spreading abroad this writing hath much advanced the cause. If we be commanded, and may have safe conduct, we will into the court.

But they mean nothing less, for they have filled all the old prisons with Catholics, and now make new ; and, in fine, plainly affirm that it were better to make a few traitors away than that so many souls should be lost. Of their martyrs they brag no more now ; for it is now come to pass, that for a few apostates and coblbers of theirs burnt, we have bishops, lords, knights, the old nobility, patterns of learning, piety, and prudence, the flower of the youth, noble matrons, and of the inferior sort innumerable, either martyred at once, or by consuming prisonment dying daily. At the very writing hereof, the persecution rages most cruelly. The house where I am is sad ; no other talk but of death, flight, prison, or spoil of their friends ; nevertheless they proceed with courage. Very many,

even at this present, being restored to the Church, new soldiers give up their names, while the old offer up their blood ; by which holy hosts and oblations God will be pleased, and we shall no question by Him overcome.

You see now, therefore, reverend father, how much need we have of your prayers and sacrifices, and other heavenly help, to go through with these things. There will never want in England men that will have care of their own salvation, nor such as shall advance other men's ; neither shall this Church here ever fail so long as priests and pastors shall be found for their sheep, rage man or devil never so much. But the rumour of present peril causeth me here to make an end. Arise God, His enemies avoid. Fare you well.—E. C.*

R. S.

Correspondence.

THE DANGER OF PHYSICAL SCIENCE.

SIR,—As I entirely agree with your view of the respective importance of the physical and moral sciences to religion, which is attacked by your correspondent "D. N.," perhaps I may be allowed to explain the nature and the points of our difference. By touching on a variety of interesting topics which do not directly affect the argument, your correspondent proves that he is animated by a sincere desire to promote the truth, and does not merely seek an occasion of controversy. I will endeavour to follow him over some of these remoter questions.

Strictly speaking, the discussion might be brought to an end in the second paragraph of his letter, where he says that the physical sciences "cease to be physical, and become moral, when they are directed to the proof of a God," &c. This is perfectly true, and it is virtually a concession of the truth of the statement impugned. Physical science has no weapons of its own by which it can assail religion, for it deals only with facts. Now, between the facts of the material creation and the truth of revelation no antagonism is possible or conceivable. They cannot approach each other without the intervention of theories, or conclusions borrowed from another branch of knowledge, and involving the moral sciences. The facts alone cannot contradict religion, and the Church cannot defend herself against them ; for as she possesses no authority to test their truth, she is unable to deny them.

* This is either a contemporary translation from Campion's original Latin, or, if he wrote in duplicate, in English and Latin, according to the rule (*Constitutiones*, part viii. cap. 1, § 9), it is his own. It is exactly like other specimens of his style. The real date is in October, for the Latin has "*quintum mensem*," the fifth month after his arrival in June. It was probably written at the same time as Father Parsons's letter, on the 17th of that month N.S., or 7th O.S.

In the next paragraph, it is a grievous error to say that moral science is atheistical because it "strives for truth in its own order, and for that alone." The confinement of each science to those inquiries which belong exclusively to its sphere, and to that method of investigation which is supplied by itself, is the best security, next to universal faith, for religious as well as scientific truth. It is by overstepping its proper boundaries, and seeking conclusions derived from another order, that science goes astray and becomes adverse to religion. Unless it labours impartially to discover all the truths that lie within its reach, and furnishes its own explanation of as many phenomena as possible, it would be hard to separate religion from superstition and error. Truth would stand on a basis of falsehood, and would learn to rely on arguments liable to be exploded at any moment, and sure to bring down contempt on religion by their ruin.

Again : it is altogether untrue that the opposition of moral science to religion, when it does oppose, "is always rather rhetorical than logical." Is this the case with inquiries into the history of the Church, the continuity of tradition, the consistency of doctrine with the text of Scripture, the rule of faith, the immortality of the soul, the nature of sin? Moral science has something to say to each of these fundamental questions ; and the Church could not survive a single breach such as Strauss, or the school of Tübingen, or the speculations of Spinoza, Condillac, or Hegel, would, if they succeeded, open in her most important defences ; and these points, which to her are essential, and which require the light of the sciences to demonstrate, are innumerable. They include the whole of the doctrine of the Church, which is open to philosophical discussion ; her history, which must encounter the scrutiny of critics ; and the monuments of revelation, which are elaborately dissected by the new philology. A single defeat on this wide expanse, and her authority would be at an end. The danger from moral science, and the necessity of preserving its alliance, extend, therefore, universally over every portion of Christian doctrine ; and every failure must be decisive, every injury mortal.

Physical science, on the contrary, can hardly bear on dogma in any intelligible way. The eternity of the world, the mortality of the soul, though sometimes assumed by natural philosophers, are matters beyond the reach of their experiments. Perhaps the only dogma the proof of which could be imagined to depend on natural science is the dogma of original sin. We must carefully eliminate from the number of those things which physical science can "smash hopelessly and entirely" all those which it cannot attack without invoking the aid of metaphysics, or borrowing hypotheses that are not its own ; and all those which are matters not of faith but of opinion, and which belong not to religion but theology, or to the human, not to the divine element in the Church. It will be found that the majority of instances in which physical science has been used to subvert the faith of individuals, or has been rebuked by

ecclesiastical authority, belong to one or other of these categories. The one problem which could by material possibility be left to the naturalists to solve, that of the unity of the human race, is not one of those on which infidel science has most relied. But by every other question on which science has been victorious religion has been the gainer.

I come to the point on which I differ most strongly from "D. N.," and on which his error, if error it be, seems to me most portentous. He gives a list of opinions in which he was brought up, but which science has gradually proved to be erroneous; and religion, he says, has received rude shocks from their weakening or demolition. It is astonishing to me that any Catholic should mix up religion with such ideas as are here recited, though I can easily believe that the faith of a Protestant in his religion might be shaken by the progress of science on these points. I trust it may be to experience of this kind your correspondent alludes, and that there is no reason for the suggestion implied, that Catholics are so imperfectly instructed as to place the chronology of the Hebrew Version, the universality of the Deluge, and the habits of carnivora, among the tests of infallibility, and the articles by which the Church must stand and fall. Protestants occupy towards the letter of the Bible a position different from our own. Having no authority to define and explain the portions which are of doctrinal importance, they are unable to distinguish between the authority of different passages. If the literal interpretation of one text is shaken, there is nothing to protect any other from the same result, and there is no refuge against the invasion of a dissolving criticism. But the Catholic avoids a collision between creation and revelation, because he possesses a criterion which separates in the Bible its natural and its supernatural character, and informs him of those things which it teaches, and which belong neither to history nor to physical science. The doctrine of his Church is not mixed up with the explanation of passages that do not affect religion. With reference to these things, a current opinion prevails in every age; but it is always formed according to the measure of the knowledge of that age; it consequently varies, and cannot afford any support to religion. The only thing which is invariable about it is the certainty that knowledge of this kind cannot be trusted by faith. The normal condition is not harmony, but a perpetual disharmony between faith and knowledge, a constant alteration of the data on which the comparison rests, a successive surrendering of established positions, and modification of theologumena founded upon them. Religion profits by the abandonment of every opinion of this kind that is abandoned. It purifies belief by removing from it the contamination of error, and strengthens it by taking away a threatening occasion of doubt for those who are imperfectly educated in religion or in science. Your correspondent confounds truth with faith, and speaks of religion when he means in fact theology. It is true that almost every step taken by the Church in the establishment of her doctrine has been

accompanied by a loss of souls, and that heresy is often, as it were, the signal of development. But to say that religion suffered by the confutation of false opinions, is to assume that she has to dread the discovery, and is in league with error for its preservation, not with truth for its advancement.

Neither religious nor scientific knowledge is stationary or complete, but the laws which regulate their increase are different. Religion has a normal development; the progress of science is erratic; the convictions of one age become superstitions in the next, and at last absurdities. The movements, therefore, do not correspond; the course of the two kinds of knowledge are not parallel, and they do not tend to approach each other. If our faith was entire and our knowledge complete, there could be no discord between the interpretation of Scripture and the interpretation of nature. But as the advancement of knowledge is not destined to be complete on earth, this harmony can never be attained. As the progress of secular knowledge is not regular, and each new discovery gives rise to new problems and obscurities, its apparent divergence from religion may actually increase, and the difficulties may be multiplied by its growth. The increase of light, instead of dispelling the darkness, may only make it more visible.

In this way those conflicts are brought about which, by making more distinct than ever the difficulty of reconciling religious with profane knowledge, accelerate the advancement of both. They give an impulse to speculation and research, because, although the whole truth is not of this world, we cannot give up seeking for it, or consent to stagnation. It is a religious duty as well as an intellectual necessity to strive continually to bring existing faith into agreement with increasing knowledge, to reconsider old solutions in obedience to new problems, and to penetrate further into the depths of divine truth which none can fathom. Thanks to this constant alternation of difficulties and answers, religious ideas expand and science advances. The natural desire of harmony, and its necessary absence, are among the chief incentives both to theological research and to physical and metaphysical inquiry.

Whilst these conflicts proceed from inadequate information in one department or the other, and therefore from an external, involuntary defect, there is an antagonism of another kind, which has its cause not in the science but in the man, and is at the root of heresy and of speculative unbelief. Here a new error rises up against a known truth. But in the questions raised by the progress of science a new truth is resisted by an old error. Theology advances by its victory in one case, and by its defeat in the other. In the first, the adversary draws his weapons from the moral sciences, and he must be repulsed, or religion would not be true. In the other, the attack comes from physical science, and may succeed, for it is directed, not against divine truth, but against errors mixed up with it. By this antagonism science renders an essential service to the Church, because it acts as a solvent. A religion that depends on false scientific premisses cannot resist it,

but the true religion is made to triumph by the dissipation of surrounding error ; and the more strenuous and severe the assault, the better. If you wish to find out which is the king's son, you must have a ferocious lion ; a tame beast will treat all alike.

The argument that physical science is dangerous because its methods are inapplicable to moral science, immediately followed by the statement that when so applied its methods are pernicious, does not appear to me a serious one. If its methods are inapplicable, the fault lies in him who inaptly applies them, and does not prove that they are wrong in themselves. But I do not think them so entirely inapplicable as "D. N." supposes. The lesson taught by the physical sciences has borne valuable fruit in the moral. The application to history and politics of that method which inquires after the properties of things has been the source of the greatest modern discoveries. It has demolished the practice of treating history as a series of accidents, or as an arbitrary process, and the habit of dealing with abstractions and ignoring facts. From the naturalist we have derived the notion of growth and development, and the notion that God manifests Himself in the regularity of His laws more than in their interruption. If the materialists make no allowance for free-will, their adversaries formerly had no room for providence ; and for this reason Mr. Buckle's method, though founded on a false hypothesis, is a move in the right direction. In history the subject is not man, who is governed by free-will, but certain moral aggregates, nations, classes, states, cities, doctrines, whose existence is regulated by the laws of their nature. It is in these things, in this historical or political physiology, that we discern the hand of God overruling the actions of men, whose freedom He does not restrain, otherwise we must write history, like biography, with men for its heroes, and can allow no divine action except in the shape of an arbitrary interference. If materialists confound design with fate, power with necessity, and dream that that which is natural is implicitly not divine, the reason is that they are materialists. Their method is incomplete, but it is necessary for those who would recognise the divine influence in the life of mankind.

Your correspondent concludes with a piece of advice to the Academy from which, as I have disputed so many of his opinions, he will not be surprised that I dissent. I cannot think physical science a suitable subject of discussion for the members of that society. In meetings of this kind, whose purpose is not the general advancement of learning, but a particular application of it, the special danger is dilettantism. People are tempted to discuss, for the sake of religion, and from a Catholic point of view, subjects of which they possess no real scientific knowledge, and thus gain hasty victories over difficulties which they have not mastered. Knowledge obtained at secondhand is enough for this purpose in presence of an audience not more deeply versed in the question than the speaker, and in which there are no competent judges. Even one who thoroughly knows his subject will suffer by the

ignorance of his hearers ; instead of being sustained by a wholesome fear of criticism, he will endeavour to avoid obscurity and tediousness by accommodating his language to the measure of their knowledge. Now secondhand information in matters of science is an evil, inevitable it is true, but still so dangerous that it ought not to be encouraged. It seduces men from the habit of serious study, makes them superficial in other things, and accustoms them to form rapid conclusions. In all cases it is a thing which sensible people keep to themselves, and which it is the business of a learned society to suppress. Now in natural science it is exceedingly common, especially among Catholics. Few men besides those whose regular or professional employment it is pursue physical science with original, independent research. Men of ordinary education cannot discuss medicine on equal terms with the doctor, anatomy with the surgeon, or chemistry with the apothecary. But the ordinary education, interests, and occupations of well-informed men prepare them to form opinions in the moral sciences, furnish them with much preliminary knowledge, and give them a general view of the subject. Classical studies naturally embrace a considerable portion of history, philosophy, and politics. In these branches, therefore, men familiar with the earliest historians, the greatest philosophers, and the fathers of political wisdom, are competent to judge, and often to speak with authority. The apprenticeship to these pursuits is served at college. Later on the classics of our own country cultivate the same faculties, and the great works of our native literature improve the powers which a classical training has developed. Among Catholics there is an additional reason which makes a difference between their physical and moral knowledge. They, and in particular the clergy, in making themselves masters of the religious ideas of their Church, are driven to study both history and philosophy, without which, for them, there is no theology. Now, the history and philosophy which serve theological studies are necessarily Catholic in character and result. They must actually contribute to the completeness and certainty of the religious system, and cannot be indifferent or merely negative, like physical science, which is not required to do services of this kind, and supplies no essential materials to the fabric of religious truth. There must be, and has always been, a Catholic history and a Catholic philosophy ; but Catholic geology or Catholic physiology is both useless and impossible. For the doctrine of the Church is ascertained and elucidated by historical and metaphysical inquiries, and her divines are necessarily historians and metaphysicians. But they are not naturalists, because physical science is not a part of the foundations of their system. While moral science must, so far as it goes, positively sustain religion, and confirm the history of revelation, and the progress of dogmatic definition, natural science need bear no such testimony, and can furnish no evidence so direct to the truth of religion.

The real danger of physical science is not its godlessness, but its popularity. It has become a subject of entertainment to those who

have no means of judging of its bearings, or of comparing it with other knowledge. It comes in the shape of definite results, and with the charm and presumption of novelty, to people whose religious instruction is so imperfect that they cannot overcome the apparent discrepancy ; whilst, having had no glimpse into the workshop of science, they know nothing of its conditions, cannot estimate its uncertainty, and are not warned of its immaturity, and of its instability. Their faith has not been strengthened, nor their vision sharpened, by the study of the moral sciences, and they cannot therefore resist the arguments of the physical. Knowledge, indeed, heals the wounds which it inflicts ; but the uneducated are unable to cultivate it so far that out of a danger it may become a remedy.

There are three things which every body should bear in mind who embarks in these discussions. First, that if physical science is really hostile to religion, it will exhibit that character most distinctly in its greatest masters ; secondly, that the most advanced stage of knowledge, the most recent discoveries, will constantly increase the force and the hostility of its arguments ; thirdly, that the hostile character and the adverse facts must be admitted by all who make any pretension to scientific eminence. Each of these conditions is necessary. They are all of them wanting.

The great naturalists of past ages were not carried away by their science from religion ; many have pursued science from the impulse which religion gave them to seek in the works of God the manifestations of His wisdom and power. Those whose discoveries were thought to affect religion most profoundly were zealous Christians. In the period of the Renaissance, when great progress was made in the knowledge of nature, and when faith had fallen low, even among divines, there was no branch of learning so Christian as natural science, and no class of learned men so religious as natural philosophers. Long after the decline of Christian philosophy in the seventeenth century, physical science preserved its reverent and pious character. But when an irreligious philosophy began to prevail, it carried the naturalists along with it ; and then, like other things, natural science became a weapon which was used against religion. It was not the cause of the change, but followed in the wake of the moral sciences, on which it depended for its position towards religion. The general character of the heroes of inductive science has been more religious than that of learned men in other branches. It is not from them that their followers have derived their irreligious tone.

Even in this century, when Protestantism has so generally declined into infidelity, the great men who represent the most advanced phase of natural science are more favourable to religion than the second rank, whose view is more circumscribed. I might illustrate this by a long series of those names most familiar to us in England, in geology, astronomy, chemistry, physiology, &c. But there are two important things to be remembered with reference to science in this country. The first is, that here, as in northern Germany, men

of science are Protestants by birth. Now, the habits of independent, faithful investigation are not favourable to submission to an arbitrary system supported by no religious authority. The character of mind which is developed by scientific study is exactly opposite to that which Protestantism requires. In particular points, moreover, of Scriptural interpretation, the naturalists may arrive at results incompatible with the opinions of divines, and a distrust of the whole system necessarily ensues. It is not therefore to be wondered at, and strengthens rather than invalidates my argument, that Kepler, Leibnitz, or Newton, should have laboured under grave suspicion of heterodoxy, or that there should not be a cordial understanding between English natural philosophers at the present day and the divines of the Established Church. I am quite ready to admit that science does not harmonise well either in its spirit or its results with the Protestant system; but the infidelity of scientific men in Protestant countries is no proof of antagonism between the truths of science and of revelation.

The second point on which we should be misled if we confined our view to the state of scientific knowledge in England is, that for obvious reasons Englishmen are somewhat behindhand in working out those results of science which interfere with the established religion. The union of Church and State is not favourable to the proclamation of unbelief by men who are in public stations, or even by men who fear the judgment of society. It is many years since things which are now startling novelties here have been published, believed, and in many cases refuted, on the Continent. Until all the political and social hindrances to the public avowal of infidel opinions are removed, we must expect that they will be constantly on the increase, or at least that they will increase in boldness and in confidence. As things now are, we cannot judge of the tendency of the last results of scientific discovery by what we observe at home. It often happens that at the moment when we are gradually approaching a tremendous conclusion, a reaction has already set in against it in the more free atmosphere of Germany. In general, this is now the case with physical science. Here, as in philosophy, divinity, history, the period of reaction has commenced, and in each of these sciences men are beginning to restore and reconstruct; for they have exhausted the possibilities of negation and destruction. I cannot expect that "D. N." will take my word for this; I may therefore refer him to the work of one of the first philosophers in Prussia, *Gott und die Natur*, by Dr. Ulrici, where the present condition of natural science, and its teaching on all questions with which religion is in any way concerned, are exhibited in a manner which must be as satisfactory to the naturalist as to the Christian.

As to the third point, I need only say that it is notorious as a matter of fact, that all naturalists are not agreed in accepting as certain conclusions all or any of those things which a Christian would be unwilling to believe. It is obvious, also, as an inference; for if it were otherwise, men of science would be not sometimes but always unbelievers. As long as there is no argument in

physical science which obliges all its professors to renounce their religion, there is no reason for those to be uneasy who obtain their knowledge from them ; and we must attribute the infidelity of those who are infidels, not to the influence of their particular studies, but to another cause.

I remain

Your obedient servant,
N. N.

Literary Notices.

The Marquis of Dalhousie's Administration of British India. Vol. I. containing "The Acquisition and Administration of the Punjab." By Edwin Arnold, M.A. (London: Saunders and Otley.) As this volume contains but a fragment of a history, it can only be criticised in its details. It contains an account of one act of Lord Dalhousie, the conquest and administration of the Punjab. This act was not altogether a voluntary one on his part. It was forced upon him, not only by the audacity of the Sikhs, but also as a necessary consequence of the Affghan war, which he inherited. As an isolated act, therefore, it stands apart from the other annexations of Lord Dalhousie ; and though it may explain, it does not necessarily justify a general policy which, to use the grandiose words of Mr. Arnold, brought about "the assumption of four kingdoms (Pegu, Nagpore, Oudh, and the Punjab), and the abolition of three thrones."

The first part of the volume narrates the conquest, the second the organisation, of the Punjab. In the first part, the writer, after proving that the war was a natural consequence of Lord Auckland's mistakes, and of Lord Palmerston's alarms about Russia, goes on to describe the military operations. The whole of this part is more like a speech than a history, mouthed rather than written, in a style cumbrous, antique, sententious, and rounded ; studded with words picked for their hardness and roughness, and occasionally with no-words, such as "statesmanly." Mr. Arnold exhibits more labour than taste, and writes as if he felt himself an advocate rather than a historian.

The history of the organisation and administration of the Punjab, is a practical lesson upon the duties of the English Government to its Oriental possessions. We have to accomplish a change both in the State and in society ; to supersede the traditional government and the traditional civilisation. Indian culture, though it was developed by the same Aryan race to which our own civilisation is indebted, has been arrested in its progress. Its law has been identified with its religion, and therefore religion has tied down the people to the social usages and opinions which were current when the laws were first reduced to a code. The religion and manners of the Orientals mutually support each other ; neither can one be changed without the other. Hence the pioneer of civilisa-

tion has to get rid of the religion of India to enable him to introduce a better culture, and the pioneer of Christianity has to get rid of the Indian culture before he can establish his religion. Thus the future progress both of Christianity and of civilisation demands that the Oriental career of England should not stop short at the point of contact with Eastern kingdoms and governments, but should go on to deal with Eastern society.

The transformation is difficult ; but the ancient world has witnessed a similar one. The early law of the Italians was very like that of the Indians, and Mr. Maine has shown how it was gradually developed into the refined and ethical jurisprudence of Rome. The Roman legists never sought to introduce violent changes into their law : their ideal law of nature was not an independent legal utopia, but a system which their laws were supposed to express, however imperfectly ; hence it was the expression, not the intention, of their laws which they sought to improve. The intention was supposed to remain the same, the legal forms were preserved ; and the ideal "law of nature," to which they ever tried to bring their law into greater conformity, was not a system imported from without, as Plato's "laws" might have been, but it was supposed to be the original intention and meaning of their law, at first clumsily expressed, but gradually cleared and enucleated. The perfect legislation of Rome grew naturally out of just such a system as prevails in India ; not by violent changes, but by judicious developments. Just so is our work in India to be accomplished ; and administrators like Lord Dalhousie, Sir Charles Napier, and the Lawrences, either by nature or by art, have been led to adopt the Roman method. They have imported no new laws or institutions ; they have violently suppressed nothing by their extrinsic and arbitrary power. But they have systematically selected those elements of Indian legislation and custom which were capable of developments in the right direction ; and by fostering the growth of these elements, they have already managed to choke all life out of some others which were most opposed to the new civilisation. It is thus that infanticide, suttee, and thuggism have been supplanted, and have disappeared from the Punjab. It is thus also that, though no open attack has been made on the Brahmins, their caste has already lost much, and is daily losing more, of its old religious influence on politics and on society. And, indeed, the Brahmins seem to feel that the day of their old supremacy, as a religious caste, is past. But this vigorous race, the parent of Indian civilisation, does not despair. It is now foremost in appropriating to itself all the advantages of Western knowledge, in order to secure by its literary and scientific preëminence the same supremacy which it once held by religious imposition upon the superstition of the inferior races.

Thus the Punjab is exhibiting the first indications of that transformation of society which it ought to be our aim to effect in our Oriental empire. The change is being brought about, not by violent suppression, nor by forcible introduction of unknown usages, but by the careful development of elements already existing among

the Indians. If the English Government could do the same for the rest of India, it would soon be on the way to give a satisfactory answer to the common question of Continental critics,—“What evidence of its empire does England expect to leave behind it in India?” If our empire lasts a century longer, we may leave behind us a society freed from the fetters of superstitions which have checked its growth for ages; and ready, perhaps, to accept the teaching of a race more faithful than ours, who will then be able to make Indians Catholics, without incurring the suspicion of too great complaisance for Indian superstitions. As it is at present constituted, the social system of India cannot be made Christian, though individual Indians may become very sincere and good converts.

The Chapel of St. John; or, a Life of Faith in the Nineteenth Century. By K. Digby. Mr. Digby's later books are personal to a degree which is embarrassing to criticism, and yet they are so inlaid with quotations as to have something the appearance of a commonplace book. On the other hand, there is so much antique simplicity in his character and mode of writing, and he views so much the whole of human nature in the individual, that it would be difficult to name a less really egotistical writer; while the narrative in which he weaves so many of the thoughts of others contains here and there original passages of such beauty, that it would be unjust in the extreme to regard him as a mere collector of extracts.

The Chapel of St. John is a sort of “In Memoriam” of the author's wife; and the combination of nineteenth-century ideas involved in the wish to commemorate her virtues in print, with the ideas of the old faith contained in the suggestion of a mortuary chapel, gives the key to a work in which past and present meet on ground common to both. Mr. Digby believes in the unity of human nature, and sympathises with its diversity; and this gives his books an indulgent and peaceful spirit which fits them to be enduring friends in those “serene hours” he is so fond of painting. It is not without importance that this aspect of Catholicity should be represented in an age and country where the attitude of Catholics is naturally apt to partake of the controversial and combative character, and where their literature, therefore, is likely to suffer from an aggrieved and restless spirit. That calmness which is so much wanting in modern literature generally is in no way opposed to earnestness or active exertion. For there is a limit to all healthy human capacities of exertion; and, as Ravignan well says, “Il faut beaucoup de force pour être doux.” Nothing is more weakening than the aimless indignation and restless irritability in which so many modern books leave one; and to those who suffer from this cause we may fairly recommend Mr. Digby's *Life of Faith in the Nineteenth Century*.

The Life of Brigadier-General Sir Samuel Bentham, K.S.G. By his Widow, M. S. Bentham. (London: Longmans.) Samuel was the brother of the more celebrated Jeremy Bentham, and applied

the same kind of mechanical and technical genius to the details of naval administration and architecture as his brother applied to law and politics. He first learned his profession in a naval dockyard, then practised it on a large scale in Russia, and at last, in spite of prospects of high advancement in that country, felt obliged by his patriotism to return home, and devote his talents to bettering our dockyards and their products. This he did, in spite of routine, the opposition of interested persons, and, at times, such a neglect on the part of the Admiralty as makes one suspect that his brother's opinions reflected some unpopularity upon him. But his widow does not once allude to this, or any other subject connected with English politics. Her biography is a remarkable proof of the effect of Benthamite philosophy over a woman's mind; she applies herself exclusively to facts, and passes over feelings, opinions, and beliefs, as if they were not only worthless but contemptible. For all this, she cannot conceal her conviction that in many instances her husband was unjustly treated. She always, however, defends him on technical grounds, and gives materials to engineers to form a contrary judgment, if the facts of the case seem to require it. Altogether the book may be pronounced a model in its peculiar line, however narrow and unethical that line may be.

The Remains of the late Mrs. Richard Trench. Edited by her Son, the Dean of Westminster. (London: Parker.) Melesina Chenevix, of French extraction and Irish birth, was married at the age of eighteen to Colonel St. George, and was a widow at two-and-twenty. She afterwards married Mr. Trench, and was detained in France with her husband by Napoleon, after the breach of the peace of Amiens, till 1806. She then returned to England, and died in 1827, in her 60th year.

The recollections of her widowhood are the most amusing part of her *Remains*. Feeling her loss most acutely, she yet knew how to grind her sorrow into colours, and to paint pictures of it for her friends. Then she wore it jauntily, and stuck a feather in it. She travelled in Germany with the best introductions; and her beauty and her tongue received princely flattery at all the German courts. At this period of her life she was a merciless critic, as is proved by her satire on Lord Nelson and the Hamiltons. Mrs. Siddons fared no better at her hands. There was but one kind of exception permitted. The keen edge of her satire was never whetted against royalty, except when some personal affront was offered to herself, and then the prince easily became "a little fiend." The way in which she falls on her knees before the head and heart of Prince Augustus, who is very attentive to her, contrasts delightfully with her dainty and squeamish manner of plucking holes in *parvenus*. As she grew older she grew juster, and judged people by a better standard. But she always remained essentially the same woman. A converser, who at first owed as much to her beauty as to her wit, and was therefore less considered when she had grown old and fat; a woman who put a fine point on her feelings, and always studied to say something pretty to her husband when she wrote to

him, nay, when she had found something very pretty, to say it not to him only, but to her other friends besides. It is not often that a woman overwhelmed with the first burst of woe after losing one of her children can coolly compose such elegant sentences as these : "A daughter is a benignant star, shining through the clouds of adversity, and embellishing every scene of joy ; her mother's companion in sorrow, her ministering angel in sickness. It is on her a mother relies to close her eyes, and to cherish her remembrance, which the scenes of busy life may soon efface from the breast of man ;" and then can more coolly copy them into other letters, and send them off, with variations, for her different correspondents to cry over. In spite of such defects, Mrs. Trench must have been a very agreeable person, and not averse to a little Platonic love-making, which she defends in a letter to her husband (p. 384). She wrote graceful verses occasionally, the best of which are in p. 434. We will give the four opening lines :

" Their eyes have met ! The irrevocable glance
 Stamped on the fantasy of each a face,
 That neither weal nor woe, nor meddling chance,
 Shall ever pluck from its warm resting-place," &c.

Compare this with another woman's lines on love at first sight in *Aurora Leigh* :

" A face flashed like a cymbal on his face,
 And shook with silent clangour brain and heart,
 Transfiguring him to music," &c.

But Mrs. Trench never pretended to a name in literature ; and her journals and anecdotes are more interesting than her compositions.

Current Events.

HOME AFFAIRS.

Naval and Military Service.

THE Navy Estimates for the year 1862-63 were introduced on the 24th of February, and speedily passed. They provide for a total force afloat of 19 line-of-battle ships, 2 iron-cased frigates, 90 sloops, 38 frigates and corvettes, and 11 coast-guard ships,—making in all 160 ships. A reduction of 2,200 on the establishment of last year brings the number of men and boys to be maintained to 76,000 ; and the total estimated expenditure is 11,794,305*l*. The Estimates for 1861-2 amounted altogether to 12,640,588*l*., including the supplementary vote for the expenses of the North-American reinforcements. The net decrease,

therefore, on the current year is 846,283*l*. A similar reduction of 600,000*l*. appears on a comparison between the Army Estimates for 1861-62 and those for the present year. These latter provide for a force of 145,450 men, and an expenditure of 14,572,000*l*. ; or including, as we ought to do, the Indian depôts, a force of 153,092, and an expenditure of 15,302,000*l*. Of this sum, however, upwards of 1,000,000*l*. is taken for stores supplied to the Admiralty by the War Department, and must therefore be subtracted from the Army Estimates, and added to those for the Navy, before we can duly apportion the expense of the two services. When this is done, it may

be said, in round numbers, that the Navy costs us 13,000,000*l.*, and the Army 14,000,000*l.*,—making a total of 27,000,000*l.* for the Naval and Military Service for the year. And as our whole national expenditure is about 70,000,000*l.*, of which 26,000,000*l.* goes in payment of interest on the National Debt, we have just 17,000,000*l.* left free for the remainder of our annual expenditure.

In moving the Army Estimates, on the 3d of March, Sir George Lewis entered into a comparison between the totals of men and money voted for the army in the years respectively preceding and following the war of the French Revolution and the Crimean War. In round numbers, we had in 1789, when the French Revolution broke out, an army of 44,000 men, for which we paid 3,000,000*l.*; and in 1818, when our establishments had settled down again, after the peace, into a normal state, we had 88,000 men, at a cost of 10,000,000*l.* In other words, the French War just doubled our army, while it more than tripled its cost. During the long peace which followed, there was a gradual increase in the number of men, with a gradual decrease in the ratio of their cost; so that in 1852 our establishment amounted to 119,000, and the expenditure to only 9,021,000*l.* A comparison of these figures with the 153,000 men, and the 15,000,000*l.* of the Estimates for the present year, will point the moral of the Crimean War, so far as it concerns the shortcomings of our former military system, and illustrate the effect which has been produced throughout Europe by the reëstablishment of Napoleonism in France.

Scarcely had the Estimates been passed, when news arrived from America of the singular battle of Hampton Roads. On the 8th of March, the *Virginia*, an iron-plated frigate belonging to the Confederate States, attacked the *Cumberland*, *Congress*, *Minnesota*, and *Roanoke*, four wooden frigates of the Federal fleet. Without herself receiving the slightest injury from the constant and heavy fire to which she was subjected, she ran down the *Cumberland* and drove the *Congress* ashore, and ultimately burnt her. She then withdrew for the night, but returned the next morning to

attack the *Minnesota* again. Here, however, her successes were interrupted by the sudden appearance of the *Monitor*, a new iron vessel belonging to the Federal States. The two iron ships now engaged one another, and fought for an hour and a half, when they parted without any decisive result; though it is said, on the one hand, that the *Virginia*, "evidently suffered to some extent," and, on the other, that she "completely riddled" the *Minnesota*. As far as the question of naval construction and gunnery is concerned, the only two important inferences to be drawn from this engagement are, (1) that iron ships can easily destroy wooden ones, and (2) that the Dahlgren guns, with which the *Virginia* was armed, are powerless against five-inch iron-plates. Both these facts had long been well known when the battle of Hampton Roads took place; and the events of that battle therefore afforded no especial ground for excitement or alarm in this country. When the news arrived, however, the public instantly jumped to a conclusion that iron ships were proved to be invulnerable, and that consequently fortifications on land could be no real defence against an invading fleet. It was in vain that Sir George Lewis and Lord Clarence Paget, on the 31st of March, and the Duke of Somerset, on the 3d of April, exposed the fallacies which had become current on the subject. The popular excitement was fed continually by the press; and, on the 4th of April, Mr. Bernal Osborne, making himself its organ, moved in the House of Commons, "that it is expedient to suspend the construction of the proposed forts at Spithead until the value of iron-roofed gun-boats for the defence of our ports and roadsteads shall have been fully considered." The first object of the Government being to prevent any irrevocable action on the very inconclusive data which had overpowered the public mind, Lord Palmerston, in reply, made a temporising speech, and it was agreed that the whole matter should be brought again under the consideration of the House of Commons, after the Easter recess.

By this means, time was given for a practical disproof of the alleged invulnerability of iron-plated ships, by

some experiments which took place at Shoeburyness, on the 8th of April, with a new 300-pounder Armstrong gun. The *Warrior* is the strongest ship afloat; and it was against a target made exactly of the same materials and strength as her broadside that the new gun was tried, at a distance of 200 yards. "The first shot, a 156-pounder," says the *Times* account, "was fired with a charge of 40 lbs. of powder. . . . This solved all doubts. With an indescribable crash that mingled fearfully with the report of the gun, the shot struck upon a comparatively uninjured plate, shattering the iron mass before it into little crumbs of metal, splintering the teak into fibres literally as small as pins, and though not passing quite through the side, yet bulging and rending the inner skin of the ship in a way that would have rendered it almost impossible to stop the leakage. The second shot (still with a 40-lb. charge) struck close by the side of the first, making the previous damage tenfold worse, if possible. To those who did not actually see the experiments it would be difficult to describe the manner in which the iron opposite the missile was broken into minute fragments like glass; how the teak was so utterly disintegrated that it more resembled tangles of fine twine than even the remains of wood-work; and how, above all, the inner iron skin was ripped into gaps like torn paper. These two shots were quite conclusive as to the power of the gun. Had they struck an iron frigate at the water-line, no means could have prevented her from sinking in half an hour. Still, however, the shot had not gone completely through the side, which it was the great object of the experiments to accomplish. The charge of powder was therefore increased from 40 lbs. to 50 lbs., and the gun levelled at the uppermost plate of the target, which had been left untouched in previous tests. On this plate a white spot was painted to guide the artillerymen; and so true was their aim,—so exactly was the centre of the mark struck,—that every vestige of the paint was obliterated. With this increased charge the shot passed, not only through the armour-plate, teak, and inner skin, but buried itself in the massive timbers that sup-

port the target, and even loosened the blocks of granite by which the whole is backed up. Had it been the side of the *Warrior* against which this missile was directed, it would not only have gone through the side, but nearly through the opposite side as well. Another white mark was then made on the lowest plate of the target, and again the artillerymen hit it with the same marvellous precision, and with the same result. The shot went through every thing; and even the fondest believers in the invulnerability of our present ironsides were obliged to confess that against such artillery, at such ranges, their plates and sides were almost as penetrable as wooden ships are now to the plain old-fashioned long 32's." It is true that all these experiments were made at the short range of 200 yards; but, on the other hand, the shot fired in each case was only a 156-pounder, while the gun from which it was fired was made for a 300-pounder; and the probability is that a shot of that weight, at 400 yards, would have a momentum sufficient to produce the same result as the lighter shot produced at 200 yards. The precise value of that result has been more clearly shown by some later experiments undertaken in order to test the power of the new gun. In the course of these experiments, a trial was made with a 50-lb. charge of powder against an iron target of three five-inch plates bolted together, being in all nearly four times the thickness of the *Warrior's* plates. "Two or three shots were fired against this, and each broke all three plates, crushing the first, ripping and splitting the second, and ripping the third in such a way as to show that even fifteen inches of metal was an insufficient protection against ordnance of this description at close ranges."

The actual superiority of the gun over the plate must now, therefore, be considered as fully vindicated. Its eventual superiority can hardly be doubtful; since, in the nature of things, there is a limit to the thickness of the iron armour in which a ship can swim, and there is no such perceptible limit to the possible development of the power of artillery. Six-and-a-half inch plates are at present held to be the utmost that any ship can carry; while, without making

the most of the artillery we already possess, we are able to pierce a target of fifteen inches. These are facts which Mr. Osborne will find it difficult to bend; and as it appears, in addition, that the abandonment of the plan of defence recommended by the Royal Commissioners would not make any money available for the immediate construction of gun-boats, it is probable that, on reconsidering the subject after the Easter recess, the House of Commons will not judge the battle of Hampton Roads to be a sufficient reason for dispensing with the fortifications in progress at Spithead.

Maritime Law.

On the 11th and 17th of March, the House of Commons discussed the following resolution, which was moved by Mr. Horsfall, and ultimately withdrawn: "That the present state of international maritime law, as affecting the rights of belligerents and neutrals, is ill-defined and unsatisfactory, and calls for the early attention of her Majesty's Government."

All the speakers in the debate started, though in opposite directions, from the text of the Declaration of Paris. It was generally admitted that a very serious injury has been inflicted on our shipping interest by the acceptance of the doctrine that free ships make free goods; but while Mr. Walpole and Mr. Disraeli urged the Government to obtain the consent of the other subscribing powers to a reconsideration of this clause in the Declaration, Lord Palmerston, following Mr. Bright, pointed out that, if the Declaration of Paris had never been agreed to, the same considerations which induced England to suspend the right of seizing enemy's goods in neutral ships at the outbreak of hostilities with Russia, would have operated in the same direction at the commencement of every subsequent war. Since the growth of the enormous mercantile navy of the United States, the interests of neutrals are too important to be disregarded, except at the risk of converting them into belligerents. And, after all, the injury done by the concession has perhaps been overrated. It is true that the carrying trade of the country is, in a great measure,

transferred in time of war to neutral ships; but if neutrals had remained liable to capture, belligerents would not be any the less so. It is hardly conceivable that we could be at war with France without an entire suspension of our trade in British bottoms. So that the change operates rather as the temporary creation of a new carrying trade than as the diversion of the old one.

If, however, this were not the case, it would still be impossible to accept Mr. Horsfall's proposition. We are told that it is the logical consequence of the Declaration of Paris. The answer to that is, that the process involves the introduction of a term in the conclusion which was not in the premisses. The clause in the Declaration of Paris exclusively affected our relations with neutrals; its supposed consequence affects our relations with belligerents; and it is hard to see how a concession to powers with whom we are at peace can necessitate a like concession to powers with whom we are at war. Such a change, if consistently followed out, must ultimately lead to the abolition of naval warfare altogether. The right of blockade would have to be given up, as Mr. Cobden has since proposed that it should be. For a blockade is as much a destruction of trade, and an interference with private interests, as the capture of merchant ships on the high seas; and it would operate with peculiar hardship upon England, because the Continental powers might evade a blockade of their own ports, by sending their ships into neutral harbours, and thence conveying their cargoes by land transport,—an advantage which would not be shared by an insular nation. Then, when blockades were once abolished, there would remain little reason for keeping up a navy, except in the form of a number of floating batteries. And how far such a change would affect the maritime supremacy of England the representatives of the shipping interest do not inform us. Nor, indeed, is it likely that, when once these reforms were introduced, either the ship-owners or the mercantile classes generally would be content to subordinate the general interests of trade to the prosperity of their own country. The merchants of England are by no

means an unpatriotic class; but, to quote the words of the Solicitor-General, "Under what system was the patriotism of English merchants fostered and maintained? Was it under the system of political wars and commercial peace, or under a system that in war bound them up together with their Government, which made them fellow-sufferers in its reverses, partners in the common stake, and looking to its success as the source or return of their own prosperity? I venture to say that the patriotism of the mercantile class would be placed in danger if in time of war their interests were separated from the general interests; if they were indemnified against the consequences of war; if they were deprived of their general interest in the maintenance of peace."

Education.

After several preliminary discussions in both Houses of Parliament, the opposition to the Revised Educational Code was brought to a point by Mr. Walpole, who moved, on the 25th of March, that the House of Commons should go into committee, in order to consider certain resolutions antagonistic to the Code, which he had previously laid upon the table. The Government did not resist this motion, but the debate on it was adjourned to the 27th; when Mr. Lowe vindicated the scheme of his department in a speech of extraordinary ability. The Code, however, was doomed; and on the next evening it was announced in general terms that the Government were prepared to make certain concessions. It was promised that a substantial portion of the grant to each school should be given on the general report of the inspector; that the principle of grouping by age should be abandoned; that pupil-teachers should be fully secured in their pay for the whole of their terms; and that future revisions should be more formally submitted to the House. These modifications are extremely important. They meet every expectation which could reasonably be entertained by the opponents of the Code, and there is no doubt that they will involve a very considerable expenditure of public money for educational purposes be-

yond the limit which the new scheme was designed to fix. The subject now stands for discussion on the 5th of May. Meanwhile the following official document has been issued, showing in detail the changes proposed to be introduced into the Code as last printed. The parts printed in brackets are changes introduced since the announcement of the 28th of March:

"ARTICLES PROPOSED IN PLACE OF ARTICLES 40-48, BOTH NUMBERS INCLUSIVE.

"[40. The managers of schools may claim at the end of each year, defined by Article 17: (a.) The sum of 4s. per scholar according to the average number in attendance throughout the year at the morning and afternoon meetings of their school, and 2s. 6d. per scholar according to the average number in attendance throughout the year at the evening meetings of the school. (b.) For every scholar who has attended more than 200 morning or afternoon meetings of their school]: 1. If more than six years of age [8s.], subject to examination (Article 48, *infra*). 2. If under six years of age [6s. 6d.], subject to a report by the inspector that such children are instructed suitably to their age, and in a manner not to interfere with the instruction of the older children. [(c.) For every scholar who has attended more than 24 evening meetings of their school, 5s., subject to examination (Article 48, *infra*).]

"[41. Attendance at a morning or afternoon meeting may not be reckoned for any scholar who has been under instruction less than two hours, nor attendance at an evening meeting for any scholar who has been under instruction less than one hour and a half.]

"[42. Evening attendances may not be reckoned with morning or afternoon attendances in making up the prescribed *minimum* of 200 or 24 attendances.]

"43. Evening attendances may not be reckoned for any scholar under 12 years of age.

"[44.] Every scholar [attending more than 200 times in the morning or afternoon for whom 8s. is claimed] forfeits [2s. 8d.] for failure to satisfy

the inspector in reading, [2s. 8d.] in writing, and [2s. 8d.] in arithmetic [(Article 48, *infra*).]

"[45.] Every scholar [attending more than 24 times in the evening for whom 5s. is claimed] forfeits [1s. 8d.] for failure to satisfy the inspector in reading, [1s. 8d.] in writing, and [1s. 8d.] in arithmetic (Article 48, *infra*).

"[46. Every scholar for whom the grants dependent upon examina-

tion are claimed must be examined according to one of the following standards, and must not be presented for examination twice according to the same or a lower standard.]

"[47. Under any Half-Time Act, 100 attendances qualify scholars for the grant: (a.) Upon examination. (b.) Without examination, after they have passed according to the highest standard, but continue to attend school under the Act.]

48.	Standard I.	[Standard II.]	Standard III.
Reading . .	Narrative in monosyllables.	[One of the narratives next in order after monosyllables in an elementary reading book used in the school.]	A short paragraph from an elementary reading book used in the school.
Writing . .	Form on blackboard or slate, from dictation, letters, capital and small manuscript.	[Copy in manuscript character a line of print.]	A sentence from the same paragraph, slowly read once, and then dictated in single words.
Arithmetic .	Form on blackboard or slate, from dictation, figures up to 20; name at sight figures up to 20; add and subtract figures up to 10; orally, from examples on blackboard.	[A sum in simple addition or subtraction, and the multiplication table.]	A sum in any simple rule as far as short division (inclusive).
	Standard IV.	[Standard V.]	Standard VI.
Reading . .	A short paragraph from a more advanced reading book used in the school.	[A few lines of poetry from a reading book used in the first class of the school.]	A short ordinary paragraph in a newspaper, or other modern narrative.
Writing . .	A sentence slowly dictated once, by a few words at a time, from the same book, but not from the paragraph read.	[A sentence slowly dictated once, by a few words at a time, from a reading book used in the first class of the school.]	Another short ordinary paragraph in a newspaper, or other modern narrative, slowly dictated once by a few words at a time.
Arithmetic .	A sum in compound rules (money).	[A sum in compound rules (common weights and measures).]	A sum in practice or bills of parcels.

"49. The grant may either be withheld altogether or reduced for causes arising out of the state of the school.

"50. The inspector does not proceed to examine scholars in reading, writing, and arithmetic for the grant, until he has first ascertained that the state of the school does not require it to be withheld.

"51. The grant is withheld altogether,—(a.) If the school be not held in a building certified by the inspector to be healthy, properly lighted, drained, and ventilated, supplied with offices, and containing in the principal schoolroom at least 80 cubical feet of internal space for each child in

average attendance. (b.) If the principal teacher be not duly certificated (Article 61), and duly paid. Teachers certificated before March 31, 1864, and who have not otherwise agreed with their employers, are duly paid if they receive not less than three times the grant allowable upon their certificates in Article 64-5 of the Code of 1860, and they have a first charge to the extent of this grant, being one-third of such due payment, upon the money received by the managers, under Article 40, *supra*. (c.) If the girls in the schools be not taught plain needlework as part of the ordinary course of instruction.

(d.) If the registers be not kept with sufficient accuracy to warrant confidence in the returns. (e.) If, on the inspector's report, there appears to be any *prima facie* objection* of a gross kind. A second inspection, wherein another inspector or inspectors takes part, is made in every such instance, and if the grant be finally withheld, a special minute is made and recorded of the case. (f.) If three persons at least be not designated to sign the receipt for the grant on behalf of the school.

"52. The grant is reduced,—(a.) By not less than one-tenth, nor more than one-half in the whole, upon the inspector's report, for faults of instruction* or discipline on the part of the teacher, or (after one year's notice) for failure on the part of the managers to remedy any such defect in the premises as seriously interferes with the efficiency of the school, or to provide proper furniture, books, maps, and other apparatus of elementary instruction. (b.) By the sum of 10*l.*, if after the first 50 scholars in average attendance there be not either one pupil-teacher fulfilling the conditions of Articles 75-83 for every 40 scholars, or one certificated or assistant-teacher fulfilling the conditions of Articles 61 and 85-7 respectively for every 80 scholars in average attendance. The forfeiture is reduced from 10*l.* to 5*l.* if the failure to comply with these articles be confined to the examination of a pupil-teacher (Article 82); but this reduction is made only once for the same pupil-teacher, and not in successive years for the same school. (c.) By its excess above: 1. The amount of school-fees and subscriptions; or 2. The rate of 15*s.* per scholar in average attendance in the year defined by Article 17.

"53. If the excess of scholars over the ratio of 40 to every pupil-teacher has arisen from increased attendance of children since the last settlement of the school-staff (Articles 56, 57), the forfeiture prescribed by Article 52 (b), *supra*, does not accrue.

"[54. Pupil-teachers admitted before the 30th of June 1862, and the

masters and mistresses by whom they are instructed, have a second charge for their several stipends and gratuities, so long as their service fulfils the conditions prescribed by the Code of 1860, upon the money received by the managers under Article 40, *supra*; and in case the money so received shall not be sufficient to meet the second charge upon it, the Committee of Council will add the sum requisite to make up the deficiency.]

"ARTICLES PROPOSED IN PLACE OF ARTICLES 136-7.

"[136. In January of each year, if the Code be revised, or any material alteration in it be necessary, it shall be printed in such a form as to show separately all articles cancelled or modified, and all new articles.]

"[137. In the event of such revision or material alteration as mentioned in the last foregoing article, it shall not be lawful to take any action thereon until the same shall have been submitted to Parliament, and laid on the table of both Houses for at least one calendar month.]"

Finance.

The Budget, introduced on the 3d of April, takes its tone from the uncertainty of American affairs, and involves no great question either of principle or policy. The actual expenditure of the year just passed was 70,838,000*l.* against an estimated expenditure of 71,374,000*l.*; and the actual revenue was 69,674,000*l.* against an estimated revenue of 70,283,000*l.* There is therefore a saving of 436,000*l.* on the estimated expenditure, and a loss of 609,000*l.* on the estimated revenue, *i. e.* a loss of 173,000*l.* on the whole estimate. Between the actual expenditure of 70,838,000*l.* and the actual revenue of 69,674,000*l.* there is a difference of 1,164,000*l.*, which is the actual deficit on the year. For 1862-3, the estimated expenditure is 70,040,000*l.*, and the estimated revenue 70,190,000*l.*, which would leave a surplus of 150,000*l.*

The deficit of last year is due to a single cause. "Every thing else," says Mr. Gladstone, "is rising, growing, flourishing; but America, both as to trade, and still more as to the supplies of raw material for our manufacturing industry, exercises a de-

* In Church-of-England Schools the Order in Council of August 10, 1840, and the Instructions to inspectors relative to examination in religion, which are founded upon it, are included under this paragraph.

pressing and lowering influence upon the vital circulation of capital and labour in this country." The results of this influence have been greatly mitigated, as far as our exports are concerned, by the operation of the French treaty, which appears to have increased the export of British produce to France by something like 150 per cent; and the trade with America itself shows symptoms of revival, the value of our exports to that country during the six months from September to February having been: in September, 483,000*l.*; in October, 709,000*l.*; in November, 739,000*l.*; in December, 805,000*l.*; in January, 1,086,000*l.*; and in February, 1,253,000*l.* But it is the failure of the cotton supply for our manufactures, not of the export trade, which is the real cause of embarrassment and apprehension; and the extreme doubtfulness of this question has determined the character of Mr. Gladstone's financial arrangements. "I have referred," he said in his statement, "to the one threatening and ominous circumstance in our position, viz. the deficient, the increasingly deficient supply of cotton. No surplus that we could ask for from the House would enable us to encounter the evils that may arise from a great further privation of that supply; and therefore if, on account of the prospect of that deficiency, we made a demand upon the House, even if we succeeded in obtaining that demand, we still could not feel the slightest confidence that we had made an adequate provision for the deficiency that might be impending. Considering, therefore, that, on the one side, if that cause of difficulty be removed, we have not the slightest reason to despond or to fear the ample sufficiency of our means; and considering, on the other hand, that any provision which we could in propriety and decency ask for from the House might fail to meet the contingencies which connect themselves with that one particular difficulty, her Majesty's Government have come to the conclu-

sion that it is not their duty to ask the House to impose any new taxes; at the same time, in the event of a great change, and a great aggravation of a pressure which is now tolerable, reserving to themselves discretion to consider in what mode it may be right to meet the exigencies of the public service, according to the circumstances which may then present themselves."

In this position of affairs, there can, of course, be no remission of taxes, in the proper sense of the term. But Mr. Gladstone's scheme commutes the hop-duties for a readjustment of the scale of brewers' licenses, on the principle of including in them the charge in respect to hop-duty, from which the brewers will be released. Threepence a barrel is the minimum of hop-duty now paid, and this sum therefore is to be added to the cost of the license; and as it would be a grievance to the regular brewer if he were required to pay hop-duty in this form while the private brewer was exempt from it altogether, every one inhabiting a house of a certain value, and under certain conditions, is to be bound, if he intend to brew, to take out a twelve-and-sixpenny license. This is the most important change contained in the budget. The next in value is an alteration in the rates of wine-duty, which are to be reduced from four to two. All wine up to twenty-six degrees of strength is to be admitted at a shilling duty; from twenty-six to forty-two degrees, it is to pay half-a-crown; and after that there is to be a prohibitory duty of threepence for every additional degree. The only other changes are the reduction of the duty on playing-cards to threepence, in order to prevent evasion; a slight modification of the inventory duty in Scotland; the imposition of a charge of one-eighth per cent on foreign and colonial bonds and loans; and the grant of supplemental licenses to permit publicans to supply their commodities at fairs and public gatherings.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Italy.

The chief weakness of the new Italian kingdom is the want of statesmen with great personal authority. The popularity of Cavour enabled him to achieve wonders—to restrain the ardour of the republicans, to sacrifice provinces to France, and to administer very deplorably ill. His successor had not the same power, and, although supported by majorities in the Chamber, could not preserve his office. Ricasoli was not an enterprising minister. He had neither the diplomatic influence necessary to involve the Powers in a great intrigue, nor the popular address which would have enabled him to use the enthusiasm of the patriots. For the solution of the Venetian problem, both these faculties are required, and therefore it slumbered under his administration. The attention of the minister was chiefly directed towards the Roman question, which was better suited to his character, to his religious sympathies, and to his desire to postpone the war with Austria. The presence of the King of Naples, and the constant disturbances in that kingdom, where the failure of the government to suppress resistance fettered its power, while the means it employed tarnished its honour, urged the immediate settlement of the claim which France has so long denied. Between a minister who directed his policy chiefly to the acquisition of Rome and the Emperor Napoleon no good feeling could exist.

On the 25th of February Ricasoli gained his last victory in the Chamber by conciliating the Left, with the declaration that he would not prevent the meetings and proceedings of the revolutionary party. The right of association, he said, was secured by the constitution, and should not be infringed. There may have been in this declaration something of the liberal, aristocratic spirit, and of that disposition to allow a free and unrestrained action without the intervention of the state, which was shown, or at least implied, in the fa-

mous proposals to the Holy See, and in which it is apparent that Ricasoli contrasted very advantageously with the despotic Cavour. But it was opposed to the spirit of the Piedmontese laws, and to the policy of the minister himself, who dreaded the movements of the revolutionists; it was considered a sign of weakness, and proved to be a moral defeat. The Baron himself afterwards declared that the vote which he obtained by this concession was hollow and unmeaning. The revolutionary party regarded the event in the same light. The alliance of the Tuscan statesman with the Mazzinists was involuntary and unnatural. They were united in several points of policy. The revolutionists, in whom animosity against the Church is strong, are naturally more eager for the conquest of Rome than of Venetia; they are also filled with hatred of Napoleon. Ricasoli, therefore, in his resistance to the French influence, and in his preference of the Roman to the Venetian question, followed the same practical end as the men to whom in principle he was most widely opposed. On the other hand, the Piedmontese party, who are attached to the throne, and desire its greatness more than the fulfilment of any theory, and who hold at Turin the reins of centralisation, which they might lose by being transplanted, dread an impolitic quarrel with France, look for its support in conquering Venetia, believe that they can obtain more of the Pope by patience than by any compromise, and hope to disable Austria by means of disturbances on the Danube. This is the disposition of the king, who is unable to master the intricacies of negotiation with Rome, and is frantic still at the peace of Villafranca.

Under the auspices of this combination Ratazzi came into office, when, on the 1st of March, Ricasoli with his colleagues resigned. Raised to power by a disreputable intrigue, without a parliamentary majority or a definite policy, suspected by a large party for his connexion with France,

and for his intention of letting the Roman question drop for a time, his position was difficult at first. The great meeting of the revolutionary party was about to take place at Genoa, and the new minister, who did not intend to attack Austria immediately, had to avoid being committed by the meeting to a policy not his own, and to prevent the rise of a patriotic excitement which he could not withstand. He overcame the difficulty by a politic use of Garibaldi. The new ministry was hardly appointed when Garibaldi appeared. He was won over by Ratazzi and the king, and induced to accept the presidency of the meeting at Genoa.

On the 9th of March the *Provedimento* Committee met, and Garibaldi presided. They adopted resolutions for the conquest of Rome, for the national armament, and for the recall of Mazzini. Garibaldi spoke for the government, and endeavoured to divert attention to Venetia. He deprived the assembly of its democratic character at home, while appealing to other nationalities for their sympathy and alliance. Whilst Garibaldi endeavoured to muzzle the revolutionary committee by his influence, Ratazzi warned it to be more guarded, and threatened to dissolve it if it failed to obey. In the Chamber he declared that his predecessor had misunderstood the law, that the right of association did not exclude the right of government intervention. It was his intention, he said, to carry out the law on the national armament, and he would not allow an association to organise a military force.

On the 21st of March Garibaldi set forth on a tour through the provinces, to keep alive the warlike spirit of the population, and to inspire them with confidence in the new administration. He was received with enthusiasm in the towns of Lombardy, and exhibited the strongest desire to promote the cause of the king. His republican friends calculate that the excitement of the national movement will at last carry the government along with it. But Italy is still in such a condition that a premature attack on Austria, without aid from France, or from a revolution in Europe, would be fatal to the new state. Only those

portions of the army which served in 1859 are really fit to cope with the armies of Austria; and they have been diluted with new materials, as it has been the policy of the Piedmontese to give their regiments no local character, but to mingle in each the men of different provinces. This has been done in particular with the 20,000 Lombards who formerly served in the Austrian army. About 1800 of these have deserted; the rest are excellent soldiers, accustomed to discipline even more severe than that of Sardinia, and may often be recognised among their comrades by their stiff and erect bearing. Very few officers exchanged the Austrian for the Sardinian service. The whole number of Lombards in the army is 28,000. In the duchies about 10,000 old soldiers have been obtained, but few officers. The recruits of Romagna make fine soldiers, but the conscription is in many cases resisted. Of the 140,000 men who served under Francis II. of Naples, hardly 30,000 have entered the Piedmontese ranks, and 20,000 men have been added by conscription. Part of this force cannot be trusted, and the state of the country obliges the government to keep from 30,000 to 40,000 reliable soldiers in Naples. In case of war the danger would increase, and it would be necessary to strengthen this garrison. The annexation of the Two Sicilies has diminished, therefore, the military resources of Victor Emmanuel. In 1859 he took the field with an army of 80,000 men, drawn from his own dominions only, and a reserve of 30,000. He could now bring against the enemy an army of 120,000 infantry of the line, tolerably well officered, and 16,000 or 20,000 Bersaglieri, the best soldiers in Italy, but deficient, like all Italians, in the use of the rifle. The cavalry is extremely weak; for it is generally of little use in an Italian campaign, from the nature of the country. At the present moment the Sardinian cavalry does not exceed 8000 men, well mounted on Neapolitan horses. The artillery amounts to 40,000 men, and is highly efficient in the field. But they are unequal to the task of battering the great fortresses of the quadrilateral, which the Italians only hope to reduce by famine. There

is a force of 16,000 *Carabinieri*, employed as *gendarmes*, and a national guard of 80,000. Neither of these could face a regular army, and they are wanted at home. The force of volunteers who might follow *Garibaldi*, if war broke out immediately, is estimated at 30,000 men. Thus the whole available force for a war on the *Mincio* this year is about 200,000 men, whom it would not require more than 130,000 Austrians to hold in check before their strong positions. In a few years, if the *Sardinians*, as they hope, succeed in consolidating their kingdom, they might also succeed in organising a force twice as numerous, and more than twice as effective as the present.

Ratazzi has had great difficulty in composing a ministry. The politicians of most weight have refused to join him. *Garibaldi*, acting in alliance with the government, has spoken in the most violent terms against the Holy See, the position of which does not appear to have been improved by the change at *Turin*. The result of it is, that the Pope is more than ever at the mercy of the Emperor of the French, and more than ever enveloped in his toils.

On the Feast of the Annunciation, the 25th of March, *Pius IX.* delivered an address at the Church of the *Minerva*, in which he touched upon his present troubles. The Bull which was rejected by the King of France, and afterwards withdrawn, in which *Boniface VIII.* undertook to demonstrate the authority of the Church over the State, adopted the words of theologians of the greatest name in France itself, *St. Bernard* and the school of *St. Victor*, in order that no national prejudice might be awakened against the Ultramontane view. We are reminded of this precaution by the resemblance of the terms used by the Holy Father, in speaking of the present importance of the temporal power, to the language of *Dr. Dollinger* in his book on the same subject. The positive conclusions of the statesmanlike divine appear to have found no response in Rome; but the limits by which he has defined the importance of the Roman sovereignty for the freedom of the Church are not ex-

ceeded by the public declaration of *Pius IX.* The position thus taken up by the Holy Father is identical with that of a party hitherto believed to be a minority among Catholics, and his words, therefore, are in no danger either of being misinterpreted or of failing to command the hearty assent of men who have dreaded those extremes to which a good conscience and the horror of wrong sometimes betray the champions even of the most righteous cause. Occupying this vantage-ground, he is enabled to accomplish that which to all authorities, but more especially to ecclesiastical authority, has ever been a most difficult task: he sets a limit to the aspirations of his more ardent and impetuous supporters at the very moment when he is rebuking the treason and hypocrisy of those who wish to rob the Holy See of its rights, and who, he affirms, "will fall into an abyss from which it is almost impossible they should ever escape."

The most important part of the address is directed against an ecclesiastic who has written to express his alarm lest at the approaching assembly of the Bishops, at *Pentecost*, the temporal power should be declared a dogma of faith. To this Pope *Pius* replies: "The Holy See does not maintain the temporal power as a dogma of faith, but it declares that the temporal power is necessary and indispensable, as long as the present order established by Providence shall endure, to sustain the independence of the spiritual power." It is certainly difficult to understand how the expectation which is here rebuked, how either hopes or fears of the promulgation of such a dogma as the necessity of the temporal power, could be entertained by an educated Catholic.

It is perhaps with reference chiefly to the approaching meeting that this discourse has been delivered. Although it surrenders nothing, it is yet so framed as to dissipate some of the expectations which the invitation to the Bishops has awakened. By stating the temporary and conditional character of the earthly sovereignty of the Head of the Church, and marking a limit beyond which its sacredness must not be insisted

on, or its absolute utility upheld, the Pope confutes the apprehensions of the Powers which have forbidden the journey of the Bishops to Rome; for those Powers acted on the supposition that their subjects would be led to take part on that occasion in some act committing them more thoroughly and irrevocably than heretofore to the maintenance of the temporal sovereignty, by which act the difficulty of a change would be increased.

The canonisation of a saint is one of the loftiest prerogatives of the Holy See. It is a solemnity so splendid and so uncommon that it has ever been an epoch in the reign of the the Pontiff who has granted it. No more fitting opportunity could be devised to point the contrast between the temporal calamities and the unshaken spiritual authority, or to prove to the world that the loss of territory and of political power, the hostility of Italy, the protection of France, and the disloyalty of Rome, do not deprive the Pope of the reverence or of the rights which he enjoys as the Vicar of Christ, and that persecution does not dissolve the communion of the militant and the triumphant Church.

So far as the mind of the Holy See influences the sentiments of Catholics, or the will of the Pope governs their acts, the declaration of March 25th adds nothing to the authority of those which have gone before it. The awe inspired by the voice of the Supreme Pontiff and the terror of excommunication have done their work already, and have had their weight in the deliberations of those who have been compelled to cast their lot with one side or the other. No man can be supposed ignorant of the penalties incurred by those who despoil the Holy See of its rights. They were imposed, not by the Pope himself as an act of defence in the circumstances of the time, but by the permanent law of the Church, as a standing menace to those who may assail her temporalities, and a lasting defence of rights which prescription does not invalidate, and which suffer nothing from the lapse of time. The recent declaration, though adding nothing to those which went before, and fall-

ing short of many which did not so distinctly provide against the errors of a pious zeal, differs from others in the character of the argument. At the outbreak of the present troubles, the perils of the temporal power came from the Revolution, from a movement politically false, and hostile to religion. Our defence, then, was to appeal to the right of the Church, to claim for the Pope the inviolable sanctity possessed by all constituted authorities, to identify his cause with that of order, property, and civil society, and while proclaiming the punishments which the Church has appointed for her assailants, to rely on the principle of legitimacy. As things went on, this principle exhibited its impotence. The monarchy with whom the papal dominion had allied itself fell; the Catholics of the universe were not Legitimists; some of them, on the principle of national independence, rejoiced at the expulsion of the Austrians; others, out of hatred for arbitrary power, triumphed in the fall of the Neapolitan throne; others, again, like the English, the Americans, and the Belgians, were committed to the belief that the rights of authority are not unconditional. The Roman government, on the other hand, was not in a position to allow any verification of the rightfulness of its own nature, or of the legality of its action. Every successive publication of documents and of conversations showed that, if it were judged by its merits, it could not endure any of the tests which are admitted by free nations. Accordingly, the political defence, the argument founded on right, failed. The argument from expediency then took its place. This argument is adopted by Dr. Döllinger in his recent book. In this work he collects the proofs of the real character of the Roman government, and argues that its existence has been injurious to religion; but nevertheless he comes to the conclusion that the Church requires for her freedom, under the present circumstances of the world, a real sovereignty in Rome. The declaration of the Pope, in like manner, puts prominently forward the interests of religion, and claims for them precedence over all considerations derived from a different

sphere of ideas. The question of right has given place to the question of expediency.

The perplexities of Catholics are not diminished by the change. We cannot hold that religion may be served by doing wrong; or that its interests suspend the obligations which in other cases are supreme; or that the canons of morality which rule both public and private life may be dispensed with for the good of the Church; or that the end justifies the means. The real defence of the papal right hitherto has been the infamy of the policy by which the Pope is assailed. Against the just discontent of the subjects of arbitrary power the monarch has no legitimate defence; but against an unjust invasion any monarch is in the right. We cannot defend the pontifical sovereignty on the principle of the indefeasible right of kings, because we believe in a Divine right which supersedes the right of kings. We cannot defend it as a government which deserves absolutely to be defended, because we do not believe that it fulfilled the legal conditions of a good government. But we may defend it on the ground that its faults disappear beside the iniquity of the Piedmontese intrigue; and this is the source of no small part of the sympathy which it still commands.

The view which has been repeated on three occasions by Dr. Döllinger, and which is identical with that expressed in the late discourse of the Pope, appears to us hardly consistent with another memorable passage in his book. We are told that temporal sovereignty is essential to the freedom of the Holy See, because, as things now are, it is impossible to find any other security for it. But we are reminded in the same paragraph, that it is not for men to set bounds to the wisdom and the power of Almighty God, that His resources are not exhausted within the limits of our horizon, that the future belongs to Him, and that His Spirit will not depart from the Church. It behoves us not to be solicitous, therefore, about that which is to come, or anxious lest events should be too powerful for Him to guide, or lest evils should grow beyond His skill to remedy, or crimes beyond His

power to baffle or avenge. The welfare of religion, though the first of our hopes and prayers, is not the rule which guides our consciences. For there is a standard of right and wrong, independent of the standard of religious expediency, and independent of the occasional utterances of ecclesiastical authority. However certain the loss to ourselves, however apparent the peril to souls, whatever the risk of trouble to the Church, we are bound to consider not advantage but right, not attachment but duty. Christians are bound to obey certain rules, which they may not transgress for any object, however holy. They must submit to the worst evils, and tolerate things which are most injurious to religion, because they cannot do wrong that good may come of it. But Almighty God brings a remedy, and effects a change in which His own servants cannot be His instruments. Evil men, guided by evil intentions, who would not follow good impulses, or act if they foresaw the end, in pursuing their own objects perform those things from which the just are bound to refrain, but by which their cause is benefited. The desire of good would be impotent to obtain many ends which God compasses by overruling the actions and designs of wicked men. The safety of the Church cannot be involved in wrongdoing, and the advancement of political right must supersede the prospect of religious advantage. The Church has never permitted insurrection against a just authority for her own sake only. She can never enjoin, for her own sake, resistance to a just demand. The keeper of the truth must be the keeper of the right, and the right is not always with authority. It is necessary, therefore, that the question of political right should be decided before the argument from religious expediency can be heard. Unfortunately, that is a question which the ecclesiastical authority cannot discuss, for the inquiry is one in which it does not occupy the position of a judge, nor even that of an advocate. In the work of the German prelate the advantage to religion is used as the final argument after the political defence has been practically refuted by

the facts which he has told; but it appears to us that such an argument cannot be admitted until the plea of misgovernment has been answered, and the doubt of possibility removed.

What is the character of the present order which is the reason of the temporal power? It is the character of revolution, of the insecurity of right, of the suppression of freedom. Constitutional states and despotic states, liberals and absolutists, vie with each other in their disposition to centralise, and in their jealousy of self-governing bodies. Men had believed for ages that the sovereign power could be neither limited nor resisted, and for near a hundred years the theory of the absolute right of kings has been encountered by the theory of the sovereignty of the people. The conflict has not produced freedom, because the popular theory borrowed from the other the centralisation and absolutism of the state, and with it the doctrine that the supreme power can do no wrong. But yet out of the contests of this revolutionary age peace must ultimately proceed; out of the modern theory of the right of kings, and the ancient theory of the rights of man, the mediæval idea of the rights of God, which is identified with neither and holds the balance between them, must revive again, as the only solution of the present troubles in Church and State. In that new condition of civil society, the Church will be the greatest gainer: she is the greatest sufferer by its absence—she must be the foremost agent in producing it. She cannot be alone prosperous and free. She prospers by the freedom of all, and suffers by the general disease. Where other rights are oppressed, hers cannot be respected. The welfare of the Church is the welfare of all; her liberties are bound up with all other liberties; between her cause and that of justice, right, and freedom, there is a constant alliance and an unswerving sympathy. If her liberty is imperilled now, so are all other liberties; when they are recovered, she will recover hers.

Prussia.

The present situation of the Prussian monarchy differs in an essential

point from that of all other States which are distracted by the almost universal conflict between conservatism, reform, and revolution, and is unintelligible if we apply the ordinary tests which may safely guide our judgment in Central and Southern Europe. In all those countries which submitted to the supremacy of the first Napoleon, the old *régime* was swept away, and a new order of things was established on the model of the French administration. Herein lies for Europe in general the great importance of the wars of the Empire. All those countries south of the Sarmatian plains, which formed in the middle ages the Christian Republic, are so intimately connected by a common history, by the unity of their civilisation, the similarity of national elements, the connexion of their religious traditions, and even by geographical arrangement, that a certain resemblance in their social and political character is unavoidable. This resemblance, secured of old by the predominance of the Church, afterwards found its visible expression in the system of international law which was founded on a certain community of political principles, and a certain harmony of national interests and motives in every part. Two things handed down from earlier times, the recognition of the ethical precepts of Christianity, and of the principle of legitimate authority, were assumed as the basis of the system. If, therefore, any nation should repudiate every acknowledgment of moral obligation, the restraint of objective law, and the securities which a graduated and therefore unequal aristocratic society affords against the abuse and the instability of power, the convulsion which effected the change at home must necessarily extend to the rest of Europe. The new element would be inconsistent with the surrounding mass, the balance of power, the faith of treaties, the existing distribution of territory would be at an end, the independence of States would be threatened by the policy of the new neighbour, every authority and every institution would be imperilled by its example.

On this account, all Europe, impelled by the voice of the greatest of statesmen, took up arms, in successive

coalitions, against the French republic. Other confederacies and alliances had been formed against the power of France. This was essentially though not expressly a war against French society; a war of principles rather than of national interests or dynastic ambition. And when revolutionary France had compelled all Europe to recognise it, a new series of efforts began under the Empire, in which Napoleon sought to secure the new order of things by assimilating to it the institutions of the neighbouring States. No peace could be permanent between the new system in France and the Europe of the old *régime*. The harmony of government and the analogy of society had not been restored by the attempt to bring back France to her old condition; the attempt to restore it by imposing on other countries the innovations of the French revolution succeeded for a time, and carried into many lands elements of further change, which so often shook the thrones in the last generation, and still play an important part in the troubles of the Continent, especially in Belgium, in Western Germany, in Southern Italy, and in Spain. In all those countries which were nearest to the frontier of France, governments were introduced in conformity with the new order of society, whose most marked characteristics were centralisation and secularisation. In all the common result was the destruction of all coördinate or intermediate authorities; the ruin of the Church and of the aristocracy as political powers; the abolition of the feeble remains of local autonomy which had survived the levelling policy of modern absolutism. In all those States, therefore, there is an absence of contiguity in the development of freedom, and a deficiency of the most important materials in the organisation of self-government. They are deprived, though not in equal measure, of those mediators which intervene between arbitrary power and lawless resistance, which moderate the exercise and temper the effects of sovereign power, which arrest the action of tyranny, prevent misgovernment, divert popular anger, and anticipate rebellion. Consequently they suffer under two great practical evils, on the side of authority, and on

the side of liberty. There is on one hand an inevitable tendency to aggravate the royal authority, as the crown, destitute of the support of kindred and coeval powers, has nothing to rely on but itself and its instrument, the bureaucracy. On the other hand, the parliament, as the only popular institution, independent of the administration, tends to absorb all power in its own hands, and is as jealous as the crown of every other authority, because such authority might be used as a weapon for its control. Centralisation carries this curse with it—that it interests both the royal and the liberal party alike in its preservation, and disinclines both to educate the people in the principles of freedom.

From this revolution, which was accomplished in all the smaller German States by the ministers of petty despots without popular disorders, Prussia remained free. Alone among continental European States she has escaped the evil of revolutionary change. During the supremacy of France after the peace of Tilsit, the social and political condition of the country underwent a vast reform, which, if it had been continued, would have fulfilled all the just requirements of modern society, and have satisfied those claims which give to the revolution elsewhere somewhat of moral justification, and still more of the excuse of that necessity which knows no law. But the reforms of Stein, wise and admirable so far as he was able to accomplish them during scarcely a year of power, were called for by peculiar temporary circumstances, and aimed at a particular momentary purpose. This purpose and these circumstances obtained for them a general support, to which they owed their success; but the completeness of the success exhausted the desire for reform, and the edifice which had been begun so happily was left unfinished in the day of prosperity. The disastrous war of 1806 had exhausted and depopulated the country; it had estranged the different classes, by making the people jealous and suspicious of the nobles who had commanded the troops; it had imposed on the king the obligation of reducing his army to 42,000 men. Stein and Scharnhorst undertook, in the face of the French, to prepare the deliver-

ance of the country by means of internal reforms. In order to reconcile the classes, to promote prosperity, to encourage agriculture, it was necessary to emancipate the peasantry, to throw down the barriers to free competition, to allow the burgher to purchase land, and the gentry to embark in trade. A liberal system of provincial and municipal administration on the ancient foundation bound up the people more closely with the crown. As the army was limited by treaty, it was necessary to train greater numbers by shortening the time of actual service, whilst the State retained the right to call out those who had been once trained. This was the origin of the Landwehr, by which in the space of three years the country obtained an army of 150,000 soldiers without awakening the suspicions of the French, and by which in 1814 the Prussian people, alone among the continental allies identified in spirit with its king, took the foremost part in the destruction of Napoleon.

The old Prussian absolutism, broken up by Stein's reforms, returned after the war of deliverance. Under the dominion of the Hegelian system in the government and the universities, liberties were refused, but education was extended, and the material prosperity of the country increased rapidly. The reconstitution of the Prussian territory justified to some extent the predominance of the royal power. The newly-acquired provinces introduced an element of weakness in the state that could be compensated for only by strengthening the crown. Prussia was formerly an essentially Protestant state, and after the conversion of the electoral family of Saxony the protector of Protestantism in the Empire; it was, moreover, the only part of Germany in which a strong feeling of national connexion, the pride of military glory, the memory of splendid achievements, and the personal influence of a series of remarkable princes, sustained a sense of political unity and a vigorous patriotism. But those bonds, which had been strengthened by the sacrifices of the seven years' war, were loosened by the acquisitions which followed the war of deliverance. One-third of the inhabitants were Catholics, connected

by no traditions with their new sovereign. Rhinelanders, Westphalians, and Poles required delicate management. A territory so scattered and a population so heterogeneous, possessing neither local connexion nor internal affinity, but held together only by a common allegiance to the same sovereign, did not possess the indispensable elements of a constitution of the modern type. No historical traditions—no imperial policy—no public opinion founded on identity of interest and supported by an equally distributed education, supplied that unity which a national parliament requires. Strength was needed in the sceptre which ruled such a discordant state. Yet the old traditions of Germany and the reforms of 1808 supplied a foundation on which a system of self-government might have been gradually developed. The provinces had, at least in name, local assemblies for the discussion of provincial affairs. The towns enjoyed the management of considerable property. There were the materials for provincial and communal autonomy, by promoting which the possibility of a free national representation might be secured. For only those who administer at home their own local affairs are competent to join in parliamentary government. The habits of liberty are matured only in the narrow circle of the parish and the *commune*. Where local as well as national concerns are administered by officials who hold their commission from the supreme and central power, the deputies who at home are in the habit of being governed go to the capital with the desire of governing. The less freedom they have known, the less they will be inclined to give; and by not governing themselves they have acquired the belief that they are to govern others as absolutely as possible. A parliament of that sort is very likely to abridge to the utmost the royal authority, and to use brave words about national independence and resistance to tyranny. But liberty and self-government it will never promote or even tolerate, and all that it takes away from the influence of the crown will go to increase the power of the state. The concession of a constitution and national representation is therefore the

greatest obstacle to the growth of freedom in a country without local self-government, for the habit as well as the theory of freedom is essential to its success. Herein lies the value of corporations in a representative system. They are a security for the existence of the right and practice of self-government in spheres where authority is not derived from the state or exercised by its ministers. To a healthy constitutional system, therefore, there is no support more important than the existence of provincial, municipal, and corporate assemblies. To a centralising constitutionalism nothing is more hateful.

In this direction it behoved the Prussian Government, after 1815, to proceed. But the doctrines of the Holy Alliance prevented this policy from being pursued. A machinery of official administration, a system of bureaucracy, was organised, skilful, intelligent, and upright beyond any other on the Continent, but despotic, infidel, meddling, and calculated to smother among the people the notion and the habit of providing for themselves. The material results of this period were splendid. The population increased from 10,400,000 in 1816, to 17,740,000 in 1858. The production of the soil, which was insufficient for the population of ten millions, is now in excess of the consumption of eighteen millions. Education is so general that 2,764,691 children attend at school, and only 5 per cent of the recruits can neither read nor write. The revenue increased from 50,000,000 dollars in 1821, to 135,341,701 in 1861. The debt, which at the end of the war amounted to 217,845,558 dollars, was reduced in 1847 to 139,884,581; it has now risen again to 247,641,481 dollars.

Until the accession of the late king nothing was done for constitutional development, and when under the influence of Radowitz he undertook to establish a system of liberties, the consequences of the delay made themselves felt. The impatience of the educated class at the absolute conservatism of the former reign had given currency to many false theories, and the extreme of repression had led to an extreme of liberalism. The sense of duty, which is the safeguard of

right, the reverence for the sovereign, which sustains authority, had been very generally subverted. Whilst the horror of arbitrary power had faded away with the decline of the Christian religion, the eagerness to have a share in the exercise of power had taken its place. Whilst, therefore, the wish for representative government grew stronger, the idea of self-government was given up; and the more an abstract constitutionalism was desired, the more unpopular was the idea of raising to maturity the ancient institutions of the country. Both the extirpation of the faith of the people, and the ruin of its political faculties, was the work of the government, and the reforms of Frederic William IV. came too late. He combined the provincial estates in a central assembly at Berlin, and promised gradually to modify its constitution, in conformity with the wants of the time. But the troubles of 1848 interrupted the enterprise, the king displayed unexpected weakness, and a constitution of the usual kind was conceded, the provincial estates remaining in their former incomplete state. The new system was in contradiction with the views and convictions of the king; he continued thenceforth to occupy a false position, and his mind at length gave way beneath the burden. Whilst he lived it was the endeavour of the Manteuffel ministry and of the bureaucratic conservatives, by whom it was supported, to prevent the actual consistent completion of the constitutional system. Alarmed by the events and doctrines of 1848, they attempted an entire reaction, using the interference of the police and arbitrary interpretations of the law for the purpose of arresting liberalism and democracy. In a policy of this kind, so essentially tortuous and unpopular, no confidence and no security could be felt; and liberty itself was deliberately repressed out of fear of its abuse. The government was worse than the party. In theory they could say that they resisted arbitrary and lawless power, whether in the form of despotism or of revolution, but that, the danger of the moment proceeding from the latter, their efforts required to be directed for the time against that alone. They might add that the fullest develop-

ment of the constitutional elements consistently with the traditions and character of the state would not have conciliated the opposition. But practically their system was illiberal, repressive, and adverse to the settlement of those questions which are involved in the establishment of constitutionalism. Consequently, they compelled the real enemies of revolution, who oppose it as much in one shape as in another, and defend the right with the same spirit against the crown and the mob, to join in the opposition of the democratic party. It is this divergence of principle from those with whom they were often obliged to act that disposed the Prussian Catholics so long to insist on the necessity of a Catholic party which should defend the Catholic interests without regard to the common bond of political principles.

A new era commenced with the Regency. An administration of a more liberal character was appointed, which gained popularity by its foreign policy, and by encouraging the movement towards unity in Germany. But the ministry were not united: one portion were Conservatives of the aristocratic school; the others belonged to the liberal party, and favoured the Nationalists. The king, who was the most vehement adversary of the constitutional designs of his brother in 1845, and concerning whose efforts at that time unpleasant revelations have recently been made in the Diaries of Varnhagen, did not trust his advisers. He was supported by the consistent Conservatives, the party of the *Kreuzzeitung*, of the aristocratic monarchy; and with these men, who, as Legitimists and Lutherans, are zealous defenders of the temporal power of the Pope, the Catholics were inclined for a time to coalesce. The Prussian Conservatives are enemies of German as well as Italian unity, extremely hostile to France, and disposed to favour Austria. It was in strict harmony with their views that King William spoke at Königsberg, when he declared that he held his crown from God alone.

This famous declaration was no more than a repudiation of the ideas of French imperialism, and a recognition of the same principles on which the crown of Great Britain rests.

Monarchy by the grace of God is the only description of monarchy which gives security for right and law. The stability of the sovereign power is a condition necessary for its limitation. The safety and sanctity of freedom cannot exist if there is a power which is above the law, and no rule of authority secure from arbitrary change. This security and basis for liberty is obtained by the acknowledgment of divine, objective right, anterior to every human law, superior to every human will. Divine right is the only barrier against arbitrary power, which must otherwise inevitably prevail, either in the form of despotism or of an omnipotent Demos, in one of those forms, namely, in which will is uncontrolled by law, and has no bounds but the limit of its strength. Either of these forms of absolute government is positively immoral, and inconsistent with the principle of ethics and with the duty of a Christian. For the limitation of authority is a categorical requirement of morality. There is a sphere of action which requires imperatively to be exempt from the control of the civil power; and any state where that exemption is denied, and which is consequently absolute, is essentially criminal. No contract or artificial balance of forces can save the principle of liberty, for they both imply the existence of absolute power, unless there be recognised principles in the state which are the result of no contract, and an institution which no power could create or remove. Hereditary monarchy is not the only way in which the divine principle of authority can be preserved; but it is the simplest, easiest, and most perfect, for it is the only one supplied without variation by nature alone. As the king is the representative of the state, he is called king by the grace of God, in order to express the divine nature of authority and right. The reverence due to both cannot be separated. To sanctify authority alone would be to idolise power; to sanctify liberty alone would be to reject law. The divine sanction is given equally to both; the divine order is equally involved in their preservation.

There is something essentially mediæval and feudal, that is, Teutonic, in the words, *Dei gratia Rex*. In an

aristocratic society, the king inherits his domains and his crown as the nobles inherit their estates and coronets. They belong to him by no popular favour, but by right of succession; and he holds them by the same tenure on which all property rests, and which is the foundation of the whole society. An aristocratic country is the only one in which the sovereign power can be efficiently defined by constitutional laws, for it is the only description of community in which tradition maintains its authority. In a democratic country the king, or at least the dynasty, is necessarily the selection of the people, and the people can never consent to forego its sovereignty. The power, wherever it lies, will be almost necessarily absolute. The royal power cannot be limited unless the popular power is limited. If there is a barrier on one side, there must be a barrier on the other. A permanent sacrifice of power on the part of those whose power is unlimited, and who cannot therefore be coerced, is necessarily extremely rare. Democracies more readily submit to a dictatorship, and surrender the whole power to one man, from whom, in case of need, they can resume it undiminished, than consent to impair their own sovereignty by perpetual restrictions on its exercise. But in an aristocracy, where property, influence, political power, are unequally distributed, they are defined and limited, and the same exact precision is naturally extended to all authority. If the crown were absolute, there would be no gradations of political power; that is to say, there would be no aristocracy. For this reason also therefore, from the aristocratic character of both, monarchy by the grace of God is the only limited monarchy.

In the parliament which was elected in November 1861, the real constitutional battle was between parliamentary centralisation and the independence of local authorities. The development of the provincial institutions which the late king intended to carry out, as an antidote both to the ideas of 1789 and to the ideas of absolute monarchy, was interrupted by the revolution. The new constitution prevented the improvement of the old, and in the contest which fol-

lowed for the restriction of the power of parliament, the importance of the local authorities was lost sight of. The democratic party, at the time of its supremacy, in 1850, carried a law by which all local self-government would have been destroyed. It was rescinded in 1856, when the conservatives predominated, and the development of the provincial system was expressly promised. Nothing was done however, and the problem was still awaiting its solution when the late ministry succeeded to office. These provincial and municipal bodies are founded on the old system of estates and orders, and are therefore opposite in character and different in spirit from the representative parliament at Berlin. Forming a group of authorities independent of the parliament, they afford a basis for the influence of the crown by which, if they were efficiently reconstructed, the fear of democratic usurpation might be entirely removed. It is on them, therefore, that the aristocratic party relies for the preservation of the predominant influence of the throne, and for the same reason the radical party wishes to destroy their conservative and corporate character by re-modelling them in accordance with the atomic system of the parliament.

In this spirit the bill of Count Schwerin, Minister of the Interior in the late administration, was conceived, by which the provincial constitution of Prussia would have been entirely subverted. It aimed at restoring the harmony which had ceased to exist in the state since a representative constitution had been granted, and the old provincial system restored. The two elements actually exist in the constitution itself, which still retains a traditional character, and is capable either of being perfected in harmony with the old laws of the country, or of being entirely separated from its historical basis, and completed upon a foreign pattern. Before this great question was settled, on the 6th of March, the government was defeated in the second chamber, by 171 to 143, on a motion which it admitted in principle, but resisted as a proof of want of confidence,—that the budget should be submitted in detail to parliament. The position of the ministry could not be defended, and on the 8th of

March they tendered their resignation. The King refused to accept it, and on the 11th of March he dissolved Parliament. The Minister for Religious Affairs, Bethmann Hollweg, having opposed this measure, and recommended the immediate appointment of a thoroughly conservative ministry, which should be ready to resist the attacks of the opposition, and believing that a dissolution would not strengthen the royal party, immediately retired. Intellectually the foremost of the ministers, and one of the most learned historians in Germany, his defection was a fatal blow to his colleagues. The remaining conservatives then proposed that after the dissolution the ministry should be remodelled, and filled with their own friends. This advice prevailed; the liberal ministers retired, and their places were filled by men of the highest conservative opinions. The King was determined to show that he would not submit to a parliamentary majority.

On the 22d of March a circular was issued by the Minister of the Interior regarding the elections, which contains the programme of the new administration. According to this circular, the government stands on constitutional ground, allows to the representation of the people all its rights, and is resolved to proceed on liberal principles in developing the system of legislation. In so doing, it appeals to the support of all the conservative elements in the country. It will regard as its foremost duty the endeavour to maintain the rights of the crown, and not to tolerate that the vigour of the monarchical rule, on which the greatness and prosperity of Prussia depend, shall be diminished in favour of a so-called parliamentary government, which it is the object of the democratic party to establish. The battle of the elections is to be between the royal power and the democracy, and every thing must be done that is consistent with the freedom of election to secure a ministerial majority. All the servants of the state are expected to contribute to this result, and any Prussian official who should take a part hostile to the government in the elections will be deemed to have broken his oath of allegiance to the king.

It is certainly true that our English ideas of parliamentary government are not applicable to Prussia, and that to submit to a representative assembly in a centralised state, is to establish a new form of absolutism, and to betray the liberties of the nation. But it is a great error to make the crown an election cry, and to bring it into direct antagonism with the people. The new ministers have committed themselves to a principle which is fatal to the freedom of election, and to all representative institutions, by directing the whole army of officials in the service of the state to influence the votes of electors. This, however, is a fault belonging to the system of administration in Prussia, and every ministry is tempted to commit it. At the same time, great sacrifices are being made to obtain popularity. The expenditure will be reduced, the army diminished, and the very measure on which the late government were defeated and the parliament dissolved is to be conceded. The new ministers have this advantage over their predecessors, that they maintain intelligible principles, and are supported by an organised party. But they will be opposed not only by the majority which prevailed in the late parliament, but by the whole of the active and intriguing party, who, in and out of Prussia, hope to make Berlin the capital of Germany.

Mexico.

The civil war in the United States has given the signal for the commencement of the reaction of the European Powers on America. The defeat of the doctrine of manifest destiny has been shown both in the loyal sentiments of Canada and in the Mexican intervention, which opens a new phase in the long struggle of the Latin and Teutonic races for supremacy in the Christian world. The political disorganisation of the emancipated colonies of England and of Spain has reached its term in both at the same time; and the resistance of the Confederate States to the growing tyranny of democracy will be an epoch also in the history of Spanish America. The cause of decline lay in the nature of society in the South-American republics, and in the character of the institutions of those of

North America. In the former it proceeded from natural causes, in the latter from political defects; and in one case was more a misfortune, in the other the fault of the people. Whilst, therefore, in the United States the reform, prompted by better knowledge, has been undertaken by the Americans themselves, and the patient ministers to himself the cruel remedy of civil war, South-American society, helpless to correct its own deficiencies or to overcome the difficulties of its position, awaits its deliverance and its cure at the hands of Europe. In Mexico especially, the political inferiority of the people to their Anglo-Saxon neighbours, and the almost unparalleled complication arising from the variety of separate races, render the country incapable of saving itself from the evils it has endured for the forty years of its independence.

The obstacles to Mexican prosperity are partly inherited from the ancient colonial system of the Spaniards, and are partly the result of the revolution. In the wonderfully elaborate policy by which the Spanish monarchy ruled the Indies for three hundred years, there was no provision for future autonomy or gradual emancipation. In accordance both with the spirit of absolutism and with the peculiar condition of the American natives, the system of paternal solicitude, of education and interference, was devised for perpetuity, and nothing was prepared with a view to a time when that system might become superfluous or disastrous. The defects of the policy insured its destruction, while its merits were of a kind which made it impossible that a salutary and durable settlement should succeed in its stead. Both these causes of subsequent failure were supplied by each of the three purposes which principally guided the colonial government of the Austrian dynasty—the security of the conquests, the enrichment of the treasury, and the conversion of the natives.

In order to prevent combinations and conspiracies among the inhabitants, the natives were separated as much as possible from the contact of Europeans, and the broadest distinction was made between the pure and

the mixed races, so that each caste was a check on the others, and regarded the crown as its protector against them. Thus the several races were prevented from mingling with each other in a common Mexican nationality, and a mutual hatred was kept alive among them, which made the intervention of the supreme power a permanent necessity. When the supremacy of Spain was destroyed, that distinction of races, which had been its chief security, became a fatal malady in the independent state, and made a republican government impossible. The Mexicans, therefore, whilst they have attempted to avoid a regular monarchy, have continually relapsed into transitory but vigorous dictatorships. In the intensity of dictatorial power they have found a substitute for a real authority, and in the frequency of change a consolation for the want of freedom. Nevertheless the separation of the Indians from the Europeans was, in its day, a wise measure. The influx from Europe could never become considerable, and the countries which Europeans could inhabit were thickly peopled with natives. If they had been mixed together, the native element would have overwhelmed the European, and the issue would have been a degenerate and sterile race.

The wealth which Spain derived from her colonies was sought in the mines, not in trade. Districts most admirably adapted for agriculture were entirely neglected. The Spanish people, indolent at home, where much of the soil was left without cultivation, were still less disposed to work in the tropics. Emigration was not encouraged by the government, foreigners were rigidly excluded from the colonies, and neither labour nor capital was imported. Nothing was done to facilitate communication and exchange. The trade with the mother country was confined to the periodical Plate-fleets; and the chief object of the colonial empire was to enrich, not the nation, a very small portion of which could take part in its benefit, but the crown. The colonies had therefore no means of developing their natural resources, no opportunity of selling their produce with advantage, and consequently no incentive to production. In conse-

quence of this short-sighted and selfish policy, which belonged to the proud and aristocratic character of the Spaniards, South America remained destitute of all appliances for the advancement of trade and culture, and the vast wealth which nature had bestowed on the country was neglected. In this respect a change had begun at the end of the eighteenth century; but its effects were hardly felt when they were cut short by the War of Independence.

The care taken for the instruction of the natives in religion and civilisation is the brightest point in the government of the Spanish colonies. The Indians were under the special guardianship of the crown, and were regarded as minors, incapable of making contracts, which would have enabled the whites to pillage and deceive them; incapable of bearing arms, which they would have been tempted to turn against each other; and forbidden to leave their new settlements without permission, lest they should relapse into savage life. This watchful care excluded freedom, and prevented advancement. The Indians obtained a certain civilisation, but the means of progress were denied them. They were educated up to a certain point, but then barriers were set to their further improvement. The privation of credit, the treatment of a native as a child in all commercial relations, necessarily prevented the accumulation of wealth. Yet the Indians were happy in their subjection to Spain, so long as it was accompanied by protection. But when that protection was lost, and subjection to Spain was exchanged for dependence on the very race against which Spain had so carefully protected them, the policy which had refused to teach them to stand alone and to act for themselves, and had thus disabled them from forming an integral part of colonial society, proved a grievous misfortune for them and for the country; they sank rapidly, and became savages once more, and enemies of the civilised people. This change had commenced before the revolution, when the Jesuits were suppressed. For the Church was the great instrument in the protection, the education, and the supervision of the Indian race; and among the Ame-

rican missionaries the Jesuits were far the first.

The position assigned to the Church in the colonies, which were the gift of the Holy See, has been one of the most injurious elements in the American republics. In the European dominions of Spain, the influence of the crown upon the Church was exorbitant, especially in consequence of the severance of the Holy Office from its connexion with Rome. But in America, where the services rendered by Spain to religion were so extraordinary, and where she promised to conquer for the Church a new hemisphere to redress the balance of her losses in the old, the prerogatives of the crown were still greater. The king enjoyed the patronage of all sees and of all benefices. No Papal Bull could be sent to America except through the Council of the Indies. No ecclesiastic could go there without the express permission of the king. Even the Annates and the proceeds of Indulgences flowed into the royal coffers. No Papal envoy could reach America but with the royal consent, and the Bull of Alexander VI. enabled the king to prevent any direct interference of the Pope in the government of the American Church. The religious orders in the colonies were dependent on the provincials in Spain, and did not communicate directly with Rome. The missions were generally in their hands, and in New Spain a mission was a government. The temporal as well as spiritual concerns were in the hands of the missionaries, and the population of a mission sometimes amounted to three thousand souls. So complete was the power of the priest that he could remove the mission with all its inhabitants, their herds and chattels, to another spot at his discretion. The missionaries were thus immediate officers of the government, discharging civil as much as ecclesiastical functions, and the condition of their enormous influence was naturally a complete subordination to the authority of the State. At the same time, in consequence of the remoteness of their settlements, and of the importance of their political position, their subordination to the ecclesiastical authority was not always so complete. The disorder which has succeeded the

seizure of the property of the missions proves how important were the services they rendered to the well-being of the colony. But to a Church richly endowed, possessing great political influence, and involved in all the changes and troubles of a distant country, the restriction of intercourse with Rome is an irremediable calamity. The natural consequences have exhibited themselves in ignorance, immorality, and in a spirit at once secular and intolerant. All these difficulties were handed over to independent America by the old Spanish domination. They have been most forcibly experienced in Mexico, the most prosperous of all Spanish colonies, and the most unfortunate of all American republics.

The colonial system of Spain seemed so secure that hardly any troops were kept in America. The day would assuredly have come when the immobility of that system would have brought on its ruin, but that day had not yet arrived when external causes led to the loss of America. The policy of the Austrian dynasty, under which the gigantic colonial empire had arisen, was gradually undermined and abandoned by the Bourbons. Towards the close of the eighteenth century, the ideas of centralisation, from which the rulers of that day expected the regeneration of mankind, began to show themselves in the administration of the colonies. The power which had till then been exercised by the viceroys on the spot, and by the Council of the Indies, was concentrated in the bureaux of Madrid. All appointments were now made by the king himself, no longer by the authorities in America; the local privileges which Philip II. had readily conceded were curtailed; and the council was placed under the control, first of all of one minister, and then of the respective ministers of each department. Still greater changes, and a greater mutability, ensued during these contests in the mother country, which were provoked by the French occupation and the constitutional movement. The unity and the traditional character of the colonial government were lost, the divisions in the country were felt in the system of administration, and extended to the colonies. The system was divided against itself,

and its administrators were opposed to one another. The councils of the rulers and the allegiance of the subjects were alike uncertain and disunited. Above all, the necessity of the English alliance for their safety at home threw down the barrier of exclusion which had so long been the cherished safeguard of the possessions of the Spaniards beyond the Atlantic. Humboldt's famous work on New Spain first laid before the world the condition of the country, and published the fact that only 80,000 Spaniards, without an effective army, held in subjection seven millions of native Mexicans.

The consequences of the Spanish policy of keeping the races separate by mutual hatred soon became evident, when the sceptre of the King of Spain was no longer powerful enough to preserve the balance, and to arbitrate between them. King Ferdinand was in captivity; King Joseph was cut off by the English from the Transatlantic dominions; the races were face to face in Mexico, and no supreme power intervened between them. The subject people had no longer a protector against the oppression of the dominant Spaniards; the Spaniards no defence against the hatred of the natives. In the movement that ensued, the foremost element was, therefore, the desire of national independence. For though a people may be justly and happily governed by a foreign state, and though a distant monarch may rule a country where various hostile races live together, yet the government of a foreign people is intolerable. The Mexicans had prospered under the Spanish crown; but when the crown was for them in abeyance, and the Spaniards who had been the instruments of the government became its masters, the political situation became as bad as that of Ireland. The paramount authority of the King of Spain was the keystone of the Mexican state, and the basis of its prosperity; when that failed, Mexico found herself in one of those positions which in all history have been the most unfailing occasions of tyranny, revolution, and extermination. But the animosity against the Spaniards was not accompanied by hatred of the King of Spain. The monarchy had not been unpopular,

and events proved that it was still essential. The actual independence of America was caused by the policy of the Cortes.

When the King of Spain was deposed by Napoleon, Mexico contributed 7,000,000 dollars to sustain the national cause. The Cortes, who were busy establishing a free constitution, refused equality of rights to the people of the colonies, and rejected the proposal of England to abolish the monopolies and throw open the trade of America. The insurrection in Mexico was begun by Hidalgo, a priest of mixed blood, with the cry, "Death to the Spaniards! Long live Ferdinand the Seventh, and our Lady of Guadalupe!" He was guided by hatred of the Europeans, by indignation at the policy of the Cortes towards America, and at the disloyalty of the Spaniards, who had joined the French, and by the alarm lest the unprotected colonies, involved in the European contest, should fall into the hands of an heretical power. Displaying the colours of the ancient empire of Anahuac, he gained over the Indian population to his side by abolishing the tribute to which they had been subject from the time of Cortez. Whilst the civil war went on, King Ferdinand was restored at Madrid, and the colonial insurrection became mixed up with the constitutional disputes at home. Imria, one of the liberal leaders, landed in Mexico with a small army, but was taken and put to death, like nearly all the Mexican leaders during the first ten years of the War of Independence.

In the year 1820 the whole country was all but pacified. Only one chief still held out on the Western coast; a force was sent against him under Colonel Iturbide, and the Viceroy wrote to Madrid that Mexico was subdued for ever. At the moment, this was welcome news to Ferdinand VII. The revolution had broken out in Spain, the expedition destined to reconquer America had been stopped by a mutiny, the constitution of 1812 had been restored, and the Cortes had issued decrees against religious bodies, and had assailed the ancient influence of the clergy: Ferdinand was in the position of Lewis XVI. in 1792, bound to a system which he hated, distrusted by his subjects, be-

trayed by his army, and seeking in vain to shelter himself behind insincere declarations. Like Lewis, he conceived the idea of making his escape and taking refuge in Mexico. There the Spanish constitution had been already proclaimed, and the Viceroy received orders to set it aside. It was too late. The clergy and the conservative party, who had supported the Spaniards in putting down the insurrection, had been already estranged from Spain by the decrees of the Cortes, and absolutists and liberals were now united in a common resistance to Spain. Thus it came to pass that the man who was chosen by the Viceroy to restore the royal power, taking advantage of the confidence he enjoyed, became the author of the independence of Mexico. Iturbide had constantly opposed the revolutionary movement. He now put himself at the head of the combined parties of independence, came to an agreement with Guerrero, the leader of the insurgents, against whom he was sent, and proclaimed the independence of Mexico, at the head of the royal army, at Iguala, 24th February 1821. The details of this famous plan betray the influence of the coalition under which it was drawn up. Mexico was declared an independent empire; a constitution was to be given by a congress; the crown was to be offered first to the King of Spain, or to one of his brothers, or, if they refused, to another European prince; the Catholic religion was declared the exclusive religion of the State; the distinction of races was abolished; the army was declared the protector of the three guarantees, namely, the Independence of the State, the Unity of the Faith, and the Union of the Races. By this politic scheme, skilfully devised to prevent disaffection, and to unite all parties in the common cause, an almost bloodless revolution was accomplished, and the independence of Mexico assured. In the month of August 1521, Cortez had conquered Mexico; and in August 1821, the sixty-fifth Viceroy of New Spain accepted the articles of Iguala, and the Spanish dominion came to an end.

Whilst the Mexican Cortes was discussing the new form of government, the Spanish Cortes was dis-

cussing the measures by which the American empire might be preserved. But they were opposed to conciliation. The spirit of national greatness and of commercial egotism was strong within them. The government proposed to throw open the American trade, to modify the application of the constitution in the points in which it was unsuited to America, and to withdraw those laws against the monasteries which had thrown the weight of the clergy on to the revolutionary side. To this the Cortes refused to consent. The laws against the Church were the great triumph of the popular party, and they were filled with resentment against the American clergy, because they, from hatred of the Cortes, had turned the scale against Spain. Thus the treaty concluded between the Viceroy and Iturbide was disallowed at Madrid, and the plan of Iguala, by which Mexico might have become an appanage of the royal family of Spain, was rejected.

Iturbide and the republicans both rejoiced at the failure of negotiations. The moderate party in congress had been labouring to preserve the connexion with Europe by the execution of the scheme of Iguala, and the establishment of a constitutional dynasty. For a time they were supreme; but when Spain rejected the treaty they were defeated, and Iturbide, who possessed the military power, was proclaimed emperor. Unable to conduct a parliamentary government, he soon dissolved the congress. The republican party gained strength, Santa Anna proclaimed the republic, and the emperor surrendered without a blow an authority which he had acquired without violence and exercised with moderation, but which he proved incompetent to defend. The last hope of an hereditary monarchy was at an end, and the period of arbitrary schemes and rapid changes from democracy to despotism commenced. The first constitution was proclaimed in October 1824. The absurdity of instituting a republic in a country with a population like that of Mexico is apparent, if we consider the materials of which it is composed.

The population of Mexico, amounting to near 8,000,000, consists of four different races,—the Creoles, the Indians, the mixed race in which the white blood

prevails, and the mixed race in which the Indian blood prevails. The Creoles, or Mexicans of pure European descent, who form the aristocracy of the country, do not exceed 300,000. Under the old dominion they were looked upon by the Spaniards, from whom they sprung, with dislike and suspicion. The father was generally only a sojourner in the land; the son was a native, and therefore a stranger to him. In Europe, where the father hoped to return in order to enjoy the fruit of his American toils, there was no place for the son. Their interests and their characters were both dissimilar. The Creoles were not part of the Spanish nation, and were not trusted, therefore, by the Spanish government. Even in the Church they could not obtain advancement. Knowing nothing of the mother country, they did not care for the maintenance of her colonial empire, and they hated and despised the Spanish emigrants, by whom they were kept down. The revolution was chiefly their work, for they were the most polished and intelligent of the native inhabitants; and the hatred of the Spanish race was kept alive by them, for, as they were the most capable, they were also the most ambitious and the most envious among the native people. Whilst they were the most bitter enemies of the Spaniards, they succeeded to the position from which the Spaniards were expelled, and generally formed the conservative, centralist, or reactionary party. For many years they retained the direction of affairs.

At the other end of the social scale are the Indians, forming a majority of the whole population. The upper class of the ancient Aztec people was exterminated, and the lower orders alone remain, with their old language and a degraded civilisation. For them the protection which the Spanish system gave exists no more; and, though all but a few frontier tribes are Christians, they have little education, and the civilising efforts of the missionaries are no longer sustained by the state. That long minority beneath the Spanish rule inspired them with no energy and no activity, and gave them neither the faculties nor the aspirations of political life. They are still excluded from the army, and their social and intellectual condition excludes them from the body politic. Peaceable, ignorant, and poor, they

form the Mexican proletariat, and are hewers of wood and drawers of water for the upper race. But in the frontier states they have returned to savage life, and depopulate the country. Emancipation has been to them an unmitigated evil.

The numbers of those of mixed blood in whom the Indian element is slight, and who deem themselves equal to whites, is near 800,000. They mingle with the Creoles, and possess a superficial cultivation borrowed from France, but, having generally little property, depend on the state for support. Amiable, dissipated, indolent, and extravagant, their object is to obtain from the public service the means of enjoyment, by the multiplication of offices, by the spoliation of the public, and by frequent disturbances, which give an opportunity for pillage or promotion. They are very numerous in the army and in the Church, among the lawyers and officials.

The *Leperos*, in whom the European descent is almost washed out by the Indian or African blood, in number about a million and a half, are the most demoralised and dangerous portion of the community. They fill the ranks of the army, form the rabble in the towns, and live in dependence on the wealthy or laborious class as servants or as thieves.

The Spaniards were banished in 1829. It is out of these elements, therefore, that the political parties of Mexico have been constructed.

The parties which had been united by the desire of independence, and reconciled by the prospect of freedom combined with a Spanish dynasty, parted again when the definitive rupture with Spain ensued, and the imperial authority was abolished. Instead of the Spanish party, a new party was formed, including all the conservative influences in the country, the clergy, the army, those who had befriended Spain, and those who had supported the unity of Iturbide's government. These are the centralists, or absolutists, or Church party, who have generally predominated, with the exception of a few short intervals, until the accession of Juarez. They have fought under various leaders, and from time to time under different standards, as different interests prevailed or required to be placed in the van. First, having clung

to Spain until Spain abandoned them, and having resisted not the throne but the innovations of the Cortes, their purpose was to preserve as much as they could of the ancient system and tradition. They had lost the throne, but they retained a strong central power. They were cut off from the mother country, but they cherished institutions which the people of the mother country had abolished. They preserved all the privileges of the Church. They upheld the discipline of the army. All that made the existence of Mexico possible formed part of their programme. But in course of time their conservatism settled into resistance and stagnation. The dread of innovation and unbelief led them to seek to keep out foreigners, and thus to exclude trade and to arrest the development of the national resources. In their solicitude for religion, they gave to the Church a civil authority, and supported her with an intolerance which has helped to corrupt the faith and the morals of the people. While insisting on the necessity of a central authority, they have lost sight of the claims of freedom.

The liberal or democratic party were federalists. They broke up the unity of the territory, and converted the provinces into separate states. In this they were encouraged first by the example of the United States, which they endeavoured to imitate. To complete the revolution, they wished to obliterate the remains of the Spanish system, and to remove all that was handed down from it. Proceeding from abstract principles, they established an artificial system, without roots in the past or harmony with the nature of the country and its inhabitants. They desired to expel the Spaniards from the country, and were restrained for a time by the English agents. Most of the adventurers and men who had nothing to lose belonged to this section; the men of property and substance were on the other side. The liberals had the support of the foreigners, and especially of the United States. They are also the party of progress, anxious for the promotion of trade and the advancement of national prosperity, and hostile, by the nature of things, to the endowment of the Church.

Between parties such as these, identified with the difference of races, divided in every interest, and controlled by no common traditions and no common purpose, it is impossible that there should be any reconciliation or united action. Their struggles are for existence, their antipathy is mortal, and the existence of the state and of society is at stake in their contests. Whichever prevails, the other must become an enemy of the state. Their antagonism cannot find vent in words; their disputes cannot be settled by debate. Force is the only arbiter they can acknowledge. They cannot consent to be at peace; they could not, if they would, be the elements of the same political community. Therefore every change of government is a revolution; all opposition takes the form of civil war. Federalism, by multiplying the centres of an almost independent authority, increased the means of resistance and the occasions of disturbance. The discontent of any one state could at any time manifest itself by a *pronunciamento*, followed by civil war and a revolution.

The original system of federation lasted thirteen years. In 1837 a central republic was introduced, which made way in 1841 for the first Dictatorship of Santa Anna. At the end of three years the central republic was restored, and made way in 1846 for the federal constitution of 1824, which was reformed in 1847, and lasted till 1853. It failed so completely that a dictatorship was required, and, though the conservative leaders were none of them partisans of Santa Anna, they placed him in power, in spite of his great unpopularity, as the only man who could save the country. The ablest of the conservatives, the eminent historian, Lucas Alaman, explained to Santa Anna, in the letter by which he was recalled, the conditions of his restoration. "The revolution was occasioned by the governor of Michoacan, who attacked the faith with his abominable principles, sought to invade the rights of the clergy, and compelled the landowners, by his irritating measures, to rise up against him. . . . But the movement would have made no progress had not clergy and landowners taken your part. This favoured your recall, and the hope that you would put an end to the prevailing anarchy was

decisive, and was the sole ground of your recall into the bosom of your country. Our envoys are commissioned to lay before you the principles on which the conservatives have determined. The first point is the maintenance of the Catholic religion, in which, independently of our belief in its divine character, we see the only bond that embraces all the Mexicans, now that all other bonds are torn asunder. We are also convinced that the ceremonies must be kept up with splendour, and the ecclesiastical property secured; and it appears to us that the supreme power ought to prohibit writings directed against the Church," &c. Santa Anna appointed Alaman minister of foreign affairs. The minister had described as follows in his history the character of his chief: "In him good and evil qualities are combined: a clear natural understanding, without moral or intellectual cultivation; enterprise without plan or purpose; energy and talent for governing, obscured by great moral defects; skill in preparing revolutions and plans for battles, with more than unskilfulness on the field of battle itself, where he was never victorious. Ever surrounded with obedient scholars and numerous followers when he brought down calamities on his country, but accompanied by few or none of them when he had to meet the enemy, Santa Anna is unquestionably one of the most remarkable characters the American revolution presents."

During his administration of two years, supported by the conservative party, Santa Anna recalled the Jesuits, prohibited the North-American coin, that the people might not always be reminded of the United States, restored security on the high roads by shooting 1500 robbers, and introduced conscription. With the help of the army he endeavoured, after the death of Alaman, to emancipate himself from the influence of the conservatives. He was overthrown by the Indian general Alvarez, his decrees were rescinded, and the separate jurisdiction of the clergy and the army abolished. This measure hastened the catastrophe of the old system in Mexico. Comonfort took the place of the incapable Indian, and endeavoured to conciliate the conservatives; but at Christmas 1855 a revolution broke

out, supported by the clergy, for the privileges of the Church. From that moment to the end the conservatives became absorbed in the Church party, as the immunities of the clergy were the cause of the conflict. As the Church was now a political party, on behalf of which war was carried on, the spoliations began by a heavy exaction on the Church of Vera Cruz. The liberal congress meanwhile voted laws by which all the central authority would be destroyed; they forbade the civil power to enforce the observance of religious vows, altered the laws relative to marriage, and entered on the discussion of the most difficult and dangerous questions.

This attack on the position of the clergy, prepared and threatened for a long time before, is the decisive event in the history of the Mexican Republic. It was caused chiefly by the state of the finances, and justified by the state of religion. It is necessary, therefore, to explain how these were affected by independence—an inquiry in which the real value of Mexico for the political observer mainly consists.

Under the Spanish dominion the wealth of New Spain was proverbial. The revenue which it supplied to the exchequer was such that, after defraying the expenses of administration, there was a surplus of nine million piastres, which made up the deficit of the other American provinces, and left between four and five million piastres for export to Spain. During the last 25 years before 1820, the average value of the annual exports from Vera Cruz was 11,141,371 piastres; the imports, 16,093,100 piastres; and, including all the Mexican harbours, the exports were 13,360,000 piastres; the imports, 19,640,000. Even in the last few years of the Spanish power, after a long civil war, with a regular army of 41,000 men to maintain, and a local militia equally numerous, the revenue of Mexico covered all expenses. In 1856, the last ordinary year, the expenditure of the Mexican government amounted to 25,000,000 piastres; the income, to 15,000,000; the deficit, to near 10,000,000. At this time the regular army consisted of hardly 10,000 men.

The administration of the finances is always the worst part of the government in a country without public mo-

ality, and without a regular and fixed authority. The frequent changes of government, the constant disorder, the principle of popular sovereignty, and the claiming to equal shares of the public wealth and power, necessarily developed a boundless corruption after the strict discipline of Spanish control had disappeared. The pillage of the treasury became the object as well as the result of revolutions, and it happened accordingly that the ministry of finance changed hands more often than any other. An administration has lasted in Mexico on an average five months. The average tenure of the office of minister of finance is only three and a half months. In thirty-three years, from 1841 to 1854, it passed into new hands one hundred and twelve times. The consequence of this was a confusion which the minister described as follows to the chamber in 1852: "As to our finances, we have no real system of taxation. That which we have is a confused mixture of unconnected remnants, which have continued on the footing of the old colonial fiscal system, with a few later alterations, without harmony, connexion, or unity, and therefore destitute of the most essential qualities." Moreover each state had its own mode of taxation. They were not, however, equally capable of bearing their share of the public burdens, which were distributed, in obedience to the principle of equality, according to population. The Border States, exposed to the incursions of the Indians, were impoverished, and compelled to spend large sums in their own defence. The democracy, unable to admit any principle of technical inequality, by which a practical inequality would have been prevented, consistently preferred to exempt these states altogether, rather than adapt their contributions to their capacity.

The same democratic policy deprived the republic of three principal sources of revenue which had been enjoyed by Spain. The Indian tribute was abolished when the inferiority of the Indians ceased to be admitted. The percentage on the revenues of the clergy disappeared when the clergy were deprived of the right of enforcing the payment of dues. The enormous domains of the crown were also sacrificed by the republic. Under the

Spaniards this source of wealth had not been properly understood, and it was wasted by their successors. A Mexican statesman, De la Rosa, in his *Ensayo sobre la Administracion Publica*, 1853, writes on this subject: "Like our ancestors, we have squandered the national estates, the richest patrimony which they left us, without any notion of its value. All our arrangements with reference to the distribution of the public lands have exhibited one and the same character, namely, that of disposing of an object whose value was unknown. . . . We never even discovered that a proper and regular course in the sale of national property would have enabled us to pay our home and foreign debt more than three times over. And would to God that the privation of every profit had been our only loss! But we were so shortsighted that every concession of national property has always endangered the nationality and independence of Mexico." In general these lands have not been cultivated by the grantees. Where they have been inhabited and cultivated, they have become independent of the republic. For the Mexicans themselves have not the materials for establishing colonies, or bringing new territories under tillage. The Indian population is not civilised enough for the purpose. The Creoles are not laborious, and prefer living on the State as soldiers or employés. Foreigners cannot settle into contented and peaceful citizens under the present order of things. They are necessarily inclined to innovate, and are therefore hated by the natives. Consequently they have either kept aloof, or have sought to be annexed to the United States.

A bankrupt state must have recourse, sooner or later, to the property of the Church, which cannot escape the common fate of the community, and cannot continue rich when the state is poor. The spoliation of the Church is as natural an event in one period of society as her endowment in another, and the reasons of the alterations are secular rather than religious. Testamentary bequests for pious works are no more a sign of the morality and religion of an age in which they are frequent, than penance is a proof of virtue. The largest bequests belong to those ages precisely when the general demoralisa-

tion and despondency were greatest, such as the fourth century and the close of the tenth; and the motives of the donors did not correspond to the results which were produced by their acts. The same policy which encourages endowments at one time opposes them at another; similar objects are promoted under different circumstances in different ways, and a possession which is an advantage under certain conditions may become a danger when they are altered. Whilst, therefore, the canon law rejects every impediment to the freedom of pious donations at the moment of death for the good of the individual soul, the practice has in fact been regulated by considerations of public utility.

At a time when all wealth was in land, and even the state relied for revenue on its domains, the support of the clergy and the requirements of the churches could be provided only by means of landed estates. The Carolingian legislation fixes therefore a minimum of land which every church must possess. In those days there was no fear of an excess, and no inducement to fix a maximum. Two things, peculiar to the condition of society in the earlier middle ages contributed to increase the growth of the landed wealth of the Church, viz. the absence of any other medium of pious donation, and the interest of the state to strengthen to the utmost, by the only means by which political power is conveyed, the stability and influence of that institution on which it was compelled chiefly to depend. In those ages land could not be sold; nobody possessed any thing which could be exchanged for the fee-simple of an estate. It could change owners, and pass from the hands of the aristocracy into the use of a middle class, only by being given or bequeathed to the Church. In this way the increasing wealth of the Church broke down the exclusiveness of feudal property, and introduced a system of leaseholds long before they extended to secular lands; and thus many men who would otherwise have remained serfs were raised into a class of free tenants.

By commencing the mobilisation of real property, and consequently the division of labour and improvement of culture, on which economical progress is founded, the Church assisted the growth of the third estate, whilst she

continued, by the nature of her proprietorship, to be connected by the closest analogy with the aristocracy. During this period, therefore, her interests harmonised with those of both the other classes, and helped for a time to reconcile them. But when the progress of industry and the growth of money produced an antagonism between capital and land, and the long contest between the people and the privileged class commenced, the Church found herself in league with the nobility, and her benefices became heirlooms of the great families. Later on, when the democratic element had destroyed the feudal barriers, and the aristocracy had lost the right of primogeniture, and divided its property, its interests became identified with those of the people against the property of the Church, which alone cannot be divided, and which became a privilege hateful to both, but more particularly to that class which formerly enjoyed the same advantage. The fall of the feudal privileges of the aristocracy is necessarily followed by the secularisation of ecclesiastical property; for it converts the ancient ally of the Church into her most ardent adversary, and destroys the affinity which had linked them together. The political influence of the Church depends upon the analogy of her condition with the society which surrounds her.

The character of permanence and perpetuity which the property of the Church maintained, natural to an institution essentially changeless and immortal, belonged originally to private estates as well. But while the wealth of the Church could not properly be diminished, there was nothing to limit its increase. The first inducements to make pious bequests subsisted in all ages, and they were multiplied when new corporations arose, and presented new claims to confidence and new incentives to charity. It consequently follows that the property of the Church tended to accumulate indefinitely, that the clergy grew more numerous than religious vocations and the spiritual necessities of the people justified, whilst they assumed obligations which it was impossible that they should discharge. It is said that in Portugal the masses appointed were more numerous than the people of the kingdom could have said had they been all priests. In ge-

neral, the proportion of ecclesiastical property in every country has rarely exceeded one-third of the whole before secularisation, or at least restrictive laws, have been introduced.

In the ages when land was the only possible mode of endowment of the Church, it was conducive in another way to the wealth of nations. The clergy are, from their character and the nature of their avocations, not very energetic employers of labour. But when there was a scanty population, a very intense development of agriculture was neither desirable nor attainable, and the clergy, though not very exacting, were the most intelligent agriculturists. We know from *Doomsday Book*, that at the time of the Conquest the Church lands were the most highly cultivated parts of the country. The qualities which in those days were merits were converted by the natural advancement of things into defects. As population increases, the soil is required to produce more; but religious bodies have less encouragement than private owners to effect improvements, because they have fewer inducements of self-interest. Wealth has most attractions for those who have most wants and most means of gratification. In these the clergy are behind the laity. Even allowing for deficiencies in the religious spirit, and for a more worldly character, the instinct of self-preservation in an ecclesiastic is confined to his own lifetime; in a layman it embraces his posterity. Again, as money becomes more abundant, the immobility of land becomes an artificial obstacle to the growth of wealth. The exclusion of capital and labour from the acquisition of land has been the ruin of aristocracies, by combining in an alliance against them the opposite interests of the burgher and the peasant; and for the same reason it is a peril to the clergy. When, from the growth of the population, food rises in price and poverty is felt, the unnatural divorce of capital and land increases the misery of the people and the difficulties of the state. These are powers which in the long-run cannot be withstood. One of two things must ensue. Either the Church at once accepts a compromise, and surrenders the whole or part of her possessions, or she first, by an unsuccessful resistance, forfeits the attachment of the people, and loses

her influence before she loses her wealth. In the nature of things the last issue is the most frequent. The Church does not usually anticipate or prevent the necessity of change. It is only when the occasion presses that she defines or reforms. As heresies are the ordinary preliminary of dogmatic development, attacks and disasters are the almost necessary prelude to alterations which sacrifice the absolute invariance of her canon law, or the integrity of her property and privileges. Nor is it easy to ascertain the precise moment when change becomes needful. The need is first asserted in the form of opposition by those who actually suffer. The consequence of delay is, that the change is brought about by a defeat of the ecclesiastical interest, and by a revolution in the state.

The Mexican clergy were placed in a false position by the original constitution of the Republic, and the subsequent progress of events has been fatal to them. Democratic equality, and a priesthood privileged by the establishment of religious intolerance, contradict each other. It is impossible that they should subsist in the same community without a conflict, for they belong to two different orders of ideas and to different stages of civil society. In Mexico, this antagonism between the democratic principle, and the exclusion of every religion beside that of the state, was mitigated by the zeal for Catholic unity which had been inherited from the Spaniards, by the jealousy of foreigners, and by the political ignorance which disguised for a time the inconsistency of the institutions. But a party existed from a very early period whose design was to introduce toleration, and who wished, partly from hatred of religion, partly from contempt for the clergy, to deprive it of its privileges and its wealth.

The Mexican Church was so completely dependent on Spain and deprived of direct intercourse with Rome, that the separation from Spain led to an entire interruption of ecclesiastical authority, which it was not easy to restore. From the beginning of the revolution, under the cura Hidalgo, and under the cura Morelos, the clergy had actively supported it, and at length decided its success. The Spanish government sought the aid of the Holy See; and on the 24th September 1824,

Leo XII. solemnly condemned the Declaration of Independence. The Metropolitan and several of the chief dignitaries thereupon sought refuge in Spain; and they were soon followed by a large portion of the priesthood, who were persecuted as Spaniards, but who were, as Spaniards, the best of the Mexican clergy. In a short time, eight of the ten episcopal sees were vacant, as well as eighty-six canonries and one-half of the parishes. The republican government claimed the right of patronage which had been exercised by the crown of Spain, but which the Holy See denied. In the year 1837, Spain recognised the independence of Mexico, and friendly relations were renewed with Rome; but the right of patronage was still refused.

The minister for religious affairs, Fonseca, explained the state of things to congress in 1852. "The natural course of events, the long period during which the metropolitan see remained without a pastor, together with the disturbances in the country, which have generally demoralised the masses, and have impeded the action of authority, have likewise exerted their pernicious influence on the secular and the regular clergy of the republic. The former, though with many honourable exceptions, is very far from possessing that degree of education, of theological information, and of the qualities necessary for its sacred office, which would enable it to exercise over society a powerful and salutary influence. The religious orders have fallen much lower both in respect of morality and learning; and it is dreadful to contemplate the enormous difference that subsists between the monks of the present day and those who aided in the Spanish conquest, and who were animated with a truly noble and religious zeal."

In 1843, an envoy was sent to Rome for the purpose of regulating the disputed points, and of restoring discipline in the Mexican Church. The revolution followed soon after, and the congress sent a present of 25,000 piastres to the Pope at Gaeta. At length, in 1851, Monsignor Clements was sent to Mexico as apostolic delegate. For two years his faculties were not recognised; and when, under the last dictatorship of Santa Anna, he attempted to introduce reforms, he was met by the jealousy of the state against Papal inter-

ference, and by the reluctance of the clergy to submit to an authority from which it had for a whole generation been practically exempt. Beyond the introduction of the Jesuits, and the restitution of their former possessions in 1853, little was accomplished. But the Jesuits have returned in considerable numbers; and it is only through their example, and the restoration of the direct authority of the Holy See, that the condition of the Church can be reformed. It is on this that the revival of the Mexican nation principally depends.

There were at that time 13 bishoprics, 1222 parishes, and 4615 priests, of whom 1043 were religious, and 1484 nuns in 58 convents. This is scarcely more than half the number of the clergy at the beginning of the century. The higher orders of the clergy were rich. The payment of tithes and first-fruits ceased to be obligatory by law in 1833; but it continued to be made, with very little diminution, from the conscientious feeling of the country people. For the same reason, the parochial clergy had no difficulty in obtaining their dues. These revenues were estimated by the minister Lerdo de Tejada at 8,000,000 piastres. But these sources of wealth necessarily diminished with the declining prosperity of the land. The real property was at least equally productive. The official *Cuadro Sinoptico de la Republica* for 1850 says, "In the district of Mexico alone, in which the value of the land cannot be estimated at less than 50,000,000 piastres, the clergy is the owner of more than half. Adding to the revenue from land the tithes and parochial dues, the total income of the clergy of the republic must exceed 20,000,000 piastres." All these estimates are, however, vague and uncertain. It is more important to consider how the clergy exercised its rights in an ignorant and devout population.

"It is unquestionable," says De la Rosa, "that many poor persons who wish to marry sell themselves to personal servitude for a long period, in order to raise the money due to the priest for performing the ceremony, and during this time they have to suffer great privations. Most of our labourers, therefore, live unmarried, or they marry only at very great sacrifices. It is a general rule in the country, that a

labouring man who marries is ruined for the rest of his life by the dues, and brings his family into debt after his death by the expenses of his interment." De la Rosa was governor of Zacatecas, and he says that thousands of instances may be found in the account-books of estates. The authority of the priests over the Indians was such, that an Indian who was in arrear with his dues, or who had missed Mass, came to be flogged at the church-door.

In the year 1851, Don Guillermo Prieto, who was soon after made minister of finance, published a work entitled *Indicaciones sobre . . . las Rentas generales*. He gives the following description of the clergy: "Those who know the present condition of the Indian population, who have witnessed the exactions, and who are convinced, as I am, of the ignorance and bad example which many priests, with honourable exceptions, give to their flock, must admit that this condition is the chief element of immorality and barbarous superstition. These are not declamations proceeding from the spirit of a demagogue, and from slavish adoption of the miserable philosophy of the encyclopedists; on the contrary, he who writes these lines is a Catholic in the full sense of the term; but for that very reason he will not cease to inveigh against abuses which disfigure and degrade Christianity."

The Prussian resident in Mexico, Richthofen, confirms the truth of these accounts. He says that it was often customary for young women who were going to be married to repair for religious instruction to the house of the priest, and stay there several months, during which they worked in his fields, so as to earn the money which was to be his due. Sometimes twenty or thirty women were to be seen in the house of a priest at one time. These reports may be exaggerated by party spirit, or unfounded. They fall very far short of what is universally stated and believed, and they do not exceed what is to be expected of a clergy separated from the centre of the Church, living in a country in which civilisation is fading in every class, and in which the means of education are utterly deficient.

A well-organised system of popular instruction was the thing most required in a republic which had suddenly raised

a half-civilised race to a political equality with the whites ; yet it has been generally neglected, and in a country so vast and so thinly peopled it presented extraordinary difficulties. Under the Spaniards it was chiefly in the hands of the clergy. But since the loss of the connexion with Spain, no intellectual influence from the mother country has conveyed to the Mexicans the nourishment which is lost by seclusion. The most highly educated portion of the clergy disappeared after the revolution. The Minister of the Interior declared in the Chamber, in 1835, "The want of schools corresponding to the requirements of the age, and to the liberal institutions which we have adopted, is the deepest source of the misfortune that we suffer." "Three-quarters of the whole nation," said Tejada, "do not know that there is such a thing in the world as ABC." The clergy could not escape the general decline of knowledge and morality ; but there is no reason to believe that it has degenerated more rapidly, or fallen lower than the other educated classes, and it has suffered more than they from defects which are in the national character. It is still the protector of the Indians, and if its influence over them were to be removed, if that regeneration of the natives which has not succeeded in the hands of the clergy should be attempted without it, and the governing parties in the state should undertake to legislate for the inferior race, the ruin of the whole nation must ensue. In this position of things, the authority which the Church still possessed in the state was an intolerable anomaly. In no other country in the world did the clergy use the secular power to so great an excess. In 1852, a Frenchman who had been married according to the French law, by the Consul at Vera Cruz, was arrested by the Bishop of Puebla, and condemned to four years' imprisonment. An American physician married a Mexican lady in the United States, and returned to dwell at Guadalajara. The Bishop sent soldiers to carry off his wife, and it was with difficulty that the American minister prevented the use of violence.

On the 15th June 1856 a decree, drawn up by Lerdo de Tejada, deprived corporations of the right of holding real property. All Church lands were declared the property of the occupy-

ing tenants. The government gained little by this measure, but the political power of the clergy was destroyed. The new constitution was completed in a radical spirit, and accepted by Comonfort, the president, on the 11th of March 1857. But the conservative party was up in arms. The Archbishop of Mexico ordered that absolution should be denied to all who took the oath to the constitution, and it was refused by a great number of men in office. The civil war began. President Comonfort himself had no faith in the constitution which his partisans had made. In December 1857 he combined with the conservatives to upset it. In January 1858 the liberals made the Indian Juarez president, and the conservatives, distrusting Comonfort, elected their own leader, General Zuloaga, who was master of the capital. Juarez, supported by the democrats of the provinces, maintained at Vera Cruz the constitution of 1857. The commercial interest was with him, and the customs were in his hands ; whilst the central government relied on the conservative party, on the wealth of the clergy, and the treasure of the churches. These resources were soon exhausted, and the clergy squandered to no purpose the wealth which it had taken centuries to accumulate. The government then had recourse to the seizure of property belonging to foreigners, by which the representatives of foreign states were driven into hostility. Till then the United States alone had recognised Juarez.

The three years' war which followed the constitution of 1857 was waged with a violence and ferocity never before seen in Mexican revolutions ; for great principles were engaged in conflict, and the existence of the republic was at stake. For a long time the conservative general, Miramon, who became commander-in-chief at the age of 27, was victorious in every encounter. Fortune turned with the fall of Guadalajara, and on 25th December 1860 Miramon fled from Mexico. The revolutionary party was triumphant, and Juarez returned to Mexico in January 1861. He carried out at once the decrees of 1857. Most of the Bishops were exiled, the remaining property of the Church was confiscated, and civil marriage was introduced. The hopeless condition of

Mexico under this government, the dissolution of civilised society, and the refusal to fulfil national obligations, were the causes of the Intervention.

On the 12th of May 1861 Mr. Mathew strongly supported the cause of the new government in a despatch to Lord John Russell. "Two petty attempts to create disturbances in this capital were discovered and put down in time. In other respects public tranquillity has not been disturbed; and however faulty and weak the present government may be, they who witnessed the murders, the acts of atrocity and of plunder, almost of daily occurrence under the government of General Miramon and his counsellors, Senor Diaz and General Marquez, cannot but appreciate the existence of law and justice. Foreigners, especially, who suffered so heavily under that arbitrary rule, and by the hatred and intolerance towards them which is a dogma of the Church party in Mexico, cannot but make a broad distinction between the past and the present." A fortnight later Sir Charles Wyke, who had arrived on the 9th, reported in different terms. "Animated by a blind hatred towards the Church party, the present government has only thought of destroying and dissipating the immense property formerly belonging to the clergy, without, however, at the same time taking advantage of the wealth thus placed at their disposal to liquidate the many obligations which at present weigh them down and cripple their resources. The Church property has generally been supposed to be worth between 60,000,000 and 80,000,000 Spanish dollars, the whole of which appears to have been frittered away without the government having any thing to show for it. A considerable amount has doubtless been spent in repaying advances at exorbitant interest, made to the liberal party when they were fighting their way to power; but still enough ought to have remained after satisfying their creditors to have left them very well off, and in a better position as to their pecuniary resources than that held by any other government. . . . The religious feelings of a fanatic population have been shocked by the destruction of churches and convents all over the country, and the disbanded monks and friars wandering

about amongst the people fan the flame of discontent, which is kept alive by the women, who, as a body, are all in favour of the Church. . . . The constitutional government is unable to maintain its authority in the various states of the federation, which are becoming *de facto* perfectly independent; so that the same causes which, under similar circumstances, broke up the Confederation of Central America into five separate republics, are now at work here, and will probably produce a like result. . . . Such is the actual state of affairs in Mexico, and your Lordship will perceive, therefore, that there is little chance of justice or redress from such people, except by the employment of force to exact that which both persuasion and menaces have hitherto failed to obtain."

While England has desired only the payment of money due to her, and the maintenance of her influence, France and Spain have been pursuing more ambitious plans. In Mexico, as well as in Peru, a powerful party has long been anxious to take refuge in monarchy from the hopeless evils of democracy. This scheme was naturally favourable to the influence of the European powers and hostile to the designs of the United States. Mr. Seward, on the 4th December, informed the three Powers that the United States could not join their alliance, that they sympathised with Mexico as a republic, and would aid it in redeeming its obligations and preventing war. Meantime the Spanish advanced guard took possession of Vera Cruz on the 17th of December without encountering resistance. The Mexican army was concentrated on the road leading to the capital. England, threatened with an American war, sent a very small force of only 700 marines. France, in consequence of the promptitude and energy with which the Spaniards commenced operations, resolved, in the middle of January, to double her force in Mexico. The Emperor Napoleon, whose views extended far beyond the immediate and acknowledged objects of the expedition was anxious to subvert the existing government, and to occupy Mexico. Negotiations were opened with a view to place the Archduke Maximilian on the Mexican throne, and the Mexican emigrants in Rome obtained the earnest support of the Pope in this de-

sign. That accomplished and ambitious prince occupies an ambiguous position in Austria, where he lies under the suspicion of having desired before the Italian war to elevate his government of the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom into a separate sovereignty, the appanage, like Tuscany and Modena, of a younger branch of the House of Lorraine. It is probable that the choice of this candidate cooled the eagerness of the Spanish government, which sought by the expedition to recover its prestige in America, not to raise up an independent potentate. The English government looked moreover with suspicion on any attempt to alter the form of government in Mexico which should not receive the free assent of the people. The attempt to form a coalition between the conservatives and the Spanish interest was defeated by the English. Miramon was sent from Havana to take the command of his party and renew the civil war; but he was arrested on the 26th of January by the English commodore.

Negotiations were carried on by the Spaniards with the Mexican government, which were encouraged by the English, and acquiesced in by the French commander. On the 19th February a convention was concluded at Soledad, in which the Mexicans declared that they required no interference in their own affairs, and would allow the allies to occupy certain towns until all should be arranged. The allies protested that they had no design to make any change in the government of the country, that the Spanish

and French troops then present should occupy the positions assigned to them, and that the English corps and the French reinforcement should leave the country. This convention, which the Spaniards must have been induced to accept by some private understanding with England, could not satisfy the Emperor Napoleon. On the 10th of March General Loremez, who had arrived with reinforcements in the Mexican waters, informed the Spanish commander that France refused to ratify the convention, and prepared, with 7500 men, to advance into the interior.

The Mexican expedition affords an opportunity of raising French influence in South America to a level with that of England. Spain is still hated with the bitterness which emancipated nationalities always entertain for the mother country. England is dreaded as a Protestant and Teutonic power. France appears, therefore, as a deliverer, preserving independence, protecting nationality, and restoring religion. It is in this last respect especially that the Mexican intervention can assist the policy of France in Europe. By becoming the arbiter of the religious restoration in the Western hemisphere, she adds vastly to the obligations of the Holy See towards her, and augments her influence over the Church. It is a new step in that policy of subverting the freedom of the Church by treacherous but important services which has guided the imperial government for several eventful years.

LONDON :

PRINTED BY ROBSON, LEVY, AND FRANKLYN,
Great New Street and Fetter Lane.

INDEX.

EDITORIAL ARTICLES.

- Dante's Philosophy of Love, 451.
 Döllinger on the Temporal Power, 1.
 Enlargement of the *Rambler*, 429.
 Moral Law and Political Legislation, 301.
 Mr. Goldwin Smith's Irish History, 190.
 The Commission on Education, and the Revised Code, 192.
 The Individual, the Corporation, and the State, 432.
 The Life of Dr. Doyle, 85.
 The Protestant Theory of Persecution, 318.
 The Revised Educational Code, 293.
 Tocqueville's Remains, 149.
 To Readers and Correspondents, 147.

COMMUNICATED ARTICLES.

- Dr. Manning on the Papal Sovereignty, 106.
 Dr. Ward on Intellect, 465.
 Edmund Campion, Nos. VI., VII., VIII., 234, 366, 504.
 Galileo and Mendelssohn, 494.
 Marshall on Christian Missions, 352.
 Rio on Christian Art, 220.
 The Education Commission, 62.

CORRESPONDENCE.

- Canon Flanagan on the Life of Edmund Campion, 124.
 Colonies, 391.
 Delation, 401.
 On Public Schools and Universities before the Reformation, 119.
 Physical and Moral Sciences in relation to Religion, 387.
 The Danger of Physical Science, 526.
 The Oaths, 250.

LITERARY NOTICES.

- Burton's City of the Saints, 411.
 Dickens's Great Expectations, 274.

- Digby's Chapel of St. John, 536.
 Dr. Brown's *Horæ Subsecivæ*, 268.
 Dr. Thompson's Aids to Faith, 408.
 Finlay's History of the Greek Revolution, 404.
 Guizot's Christian Church and Society in 1861, 265.
 Life and Letters of John Angell James, 273.
 Life of Brigadier-General Sir Samuel Bentham, 536.
 Marquis of Dalhousie's Administration of British India, 534.
 Memorials of Rev. Joseph Sortain, 273.
 Memorials of Sergeant William Marjoram, 273.
 Remains of the late Mrs. Richard Trench, 537.
 Rossetti's Early Italian Poets, 412.
 Smiles's Lives of the Engineers, 413.
 The Life of Edward Forbes, 269.
 Thornbury's Life of J. M. W. Turner, 270.
 Tilley's Japan, the Amoor, and the Pacific, 129.
 Travels and Adventures of Joseph Wolff, 271.

CURRENT EVENTS.

HOME AFFAIRS.

- Education, 542.
 Finance, 544.
 Home Affairs, 414.
 Maritime Law, 541.
 Naval and Military Service, 538.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

- America, 281.
 France: the Society of St. Vincent of Paul, 417.
 France: the Budget, 418.
 " Population, 425.
 Italian Revolution, 131.
 Italy, 546.
 Mexico, 557.
 Prussia, 551.
 The Piedmontese Ultimatum to the Holy See, 277.

